VINDICIÆ *FIDEI*,

OR

A TREATISE of Iustification by Faith,

wherein the truth of that point is fully cleared, and vindicated from the cauills of it's Aduersaries

Deliuered at Magdalen Hall in Oxford; By WILLIAM PEMBLE, Mr of Arts.

The second Edition.

---And be found in him not hauing mine owne righteousnesse, which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousnesse which is of God by Faith. PHILIP. 3. 9

AT OXFORD,
Printed by IOHN LICHFIELD, Printer to the Vniuersitie, for EDWARD FORREST. 1629

2

868.03

5378

TO

THE RIGHT VVORSHIPFVLL

Mr Dr WILKINSON Principall of *Magdalen Hall*: The *Masters*, *Bachelours, and other Students of that flourishing Society.*

* * * * *

SIRS,

CVstome hath made Dedication of Books almost as common, as Printing of them: and Wisdome directs there to dedicate, where we owe either respect, or thankes: this worke therefore is Yours by right, the Author thereof (who is now with

God) vndertaking it at your requeſt, and performing it amongſt you for your good, ſo that now to beſtow it vpon you is not a gift, but retribution: and I hope, it will both ſtirre you vp to be carefull to continue fit men to ſtand vp in his place, and remaine to his ſucceſſours as a patterne of imitation, if it bee too high for æmulation. To commend this Author to you, were to bring Owles to Athens, and for me to commend the Worke, would not adde much worth to it: I knowe nothing can diſparage it, vnleſſe it be a naked Margent: but you and all that will bee pleaſed to take notice of his yeares, and great abilities in all humane learning, will confeſſe hee could not haue time to read many Fathers, and ſo that defect may be eaſily pardoned. For hee had fully finiſhed ſixe luſters of yeares, yet had he throughly traced the circle of the Arts, and attained to an eminencie, not onely in thoſe ordinary Sciences, wherein all Schollers haue ſome ſmattering, but euen in thoſe ſublimer ſpeculations of which all are not capable, few ſearch after: For hee was expert in the *Mathematickes* both mixt, and pure: his skill in Hiſtories was alſo praiſe-worthie: ſome time he ſpent (and not without

without ſucceſſe) in trauailing to learne forraine languages, and much trauaile in the ſtudy of our home-taught tongues, that he had worth to haue beene Profeſſour either in *Greeke* or *Hebrewe*: all which endowments, as they might afterwards haue enabled him to read with much profit, ſo could they not chuſe but preuent younger yeares from reading at all the Ancient Fathers: ſo that it was not want, but abundance of learning that tooke vp his time, and preuented his Margent, and therefore I hope ſhall not diſparage this worke. The firſt weapon young Fencers learne to vſe is ſingle Sword, when they are Maſters of that, they enlarge their skill; our Author was but young, let it not prejudice him, that he firſt vſes onely the ſword of the Spirit, the word of God; eſpecially ſith that is ſo dextrouſly weelded, that by it alone hee hath deadly wounded the Romiſh *Leviathan*: Therefore (as in my knowledge) theſe Lectures were heard with much applauſe, ſo doe I perſwade my ſelfe, they will bee read with great approbation, and occaſion the publiſhing of other Lectures, and priuate labours, wherein he tooke no leſſe paines, nor deſerued leſſe praiſe, then in his

publique endeauours. So hoping that you will accept this ſmall paines of mine, I take my leaue and reſt

From Tewkeisbury this
9 of Iuly 1629.

Yours: willing to doe you greater,
though not more acceptable
ſervice,

IOHN GEREE.

To the Christian Reader.

GEntle Reader, this Treatise was neither finished nor polished by the Author: Hee left it with mee when he died, to bee dealt with as cause should require; vpon perusall, I found it fit for the time, so full of life, so sound and cleere in proofe, that in my conceit it will doe much good: & here thou hast it, as he left it. The argument is of all, in difference betwixt vs & Papists, the chiefest, no controuersie more disputed, and lesse agreed vpon then this. Christ & his blood is the maine cause of our spirituall peace; Papists and others diuide with him, and take something to themselues: the spirituall pride that is in the heart of man, would faine haue a finger in the worke of saluation, of other controuersies betwixt vs and the other party: some be for the Popes Kitchin, some for the Popes crowne, but this of our iustification, toucheth the life of grace to the quick, breeds more in our flesh then any, and those sicknesses are most dangerous, that come from within. It is a fundamentall case, wherein to faile takes away the essence of a christian: wherefore sith there is now such need to haue the world confirmed in this truth of God, I thought good to send this booke abroad, wherein this is put out of question to any man of a single eye; that we are not iustified by any thing wee can doe or suffer.

Many write bookes, and confute them themselues when they haue done; but this our Author what he wrote, he beleeued, for being to die, hee confirmed this Truth, in a discourse full of life and power, and professed to take his last vpon it, that it was the very truth of God. Wee reade that some learned Papists, when they are to giue vp the ghost, disclaime their

their owne merits, and would faine finde all in Christ alone: but this our Author did it before ſundry, with that life, and feeling, and cleare apprehenſion of the loue of God in his ſon, that ſuch as heard him, and loued him well and long, could not well tell, whether they ſhould weepe, or reioice; weepe to ſee a friend die, reioice to ſee him die ſo. Good Reader, learne this holy inſtruction out of this booke: that wee are not to bee found in our owne righteouſneſſe at all and beleeue it; thou ſhalt haue as he had, peace paſſing all vnderſtanding, in life, and in death, for being iuſtified by faith (not by workes) wee haue peace with God ſaith Saint Paul. *If any ingenuous learned Papiſt would vndertake to anſwere this booke, me thinkes I might prophecy that as* Vergerius *(Biſhop of Capod Iſtria, & Nuncio to* Clement *the ſeuenth, and* Paul *the third) reading* Luther, *to anſwere* Luther, *was conuerted, and had his ſoule ſaued. And as* Pigius, *though of a peeuiſh Spirit enough, yet reading* Caluin, *to confute* Caluin, *was in the very doctrine of Iuſtification confuted himſelfe, and wrought with vs. So I ſay, would a modeſt Papiſt read this booke to reply vnto it, he could not but ſee the truth, and yeeld vnto it. For though many haue done excellently in this argument, yet to ſpeake my opinion freely, at leaſt for perſpicuity, this ſurpaſſeth them all. Farewell.*

Thine in Chriſt, Rich. Capel.

A TREATISE OF IVSTIFICATION

CAP. I.

The explication of these tearmes. First, Iustice, or Righteousnesse. Secondly, Iustification.

HAuing by Gods assistance dispatched two of those generall points at first proposed (touching the Antecedents and Nature of true Faith) we are now by the same helpe to goe forward to the third generall head; namely, concerning the Consequents of Faith, which were two, our *Iustification* in regard of God, and our *Obedience* in regard of our selues. The former will shew vs how to iudge of the dignity and excellent worth of Faith; being so farre honoured in Gods gratious acceptance, as to be made the blessed instrument of our spirituall peace and comfort flowing from our Iustification. The latter will direct vs how to make triall of the truth of our faith in the discovery of that vnseparable Vnion which there is betweene beleeuing, and obeying. *Sect. 1. c. 1.*

Let vs begin with the former, our *Iustification*, the doctrine whereof I shall endeauour to deliuer vnto you, as briefely and plainely, as so large and difficult a subiect will giue leaue. Wherein because the opening of the word will giue vs some light for the vnderstanding of the matter: wee are in the first place to see what is meant by these words, Iustification, and Iustice, or Righteousnesse.

Iustice, therefore, or Righteousnesse (that I meane which is created, for of vncreated Righteousnesse, wee haue not to speake) is nothing but a perfect conformity and agreement with the Law of God. For Gods will being originally, essentially, and infinitely righteous; must needs bee the patterne and rule of all derivatiue & finite righteousnesse. Now this righteousnesse (though but one in its substance, neuertheleſſe) admits a double consideration, being called either,

1 *Legall* and of *Workes*, which stands in that conformity vnto Gods law, which is inherent within our selues, when in our owne persons and workes wee possesse and practise that righteousnesse which is required of the Law.

This *Legall* Iustice is also double.

1 Of *Obedience*, when all such things are done, as the Law commandeth; & left vndone which it forbids. He that doth so is a iust man.

2 Of *Punishment* or *Satisfaction*, when the breach of the Law is satisfied by enduring the vtmost of such penalties, as the rigour of the Law required. For not only he who doth what the Law commandeth: but euen he also that suffereth all such punishments, as the Law-giuer in iustice can inflict for the breach of the Law, is to bee accounted a iust man, and reckoned after such satisfaction made, as no transgressor of the Law. The reason of this is plaine from the nature of penall Lawes. For

For first, where the penalty is suffered, there the *will* of the *Law-giuer* is satisfied; for as much as his will was, either that the law should be obserued, or the punishment vndergone. If therefore he, to whome the law is giuen, doe either: he satisfies the will of the Law-giuer. Had his will beene absolute, so that nothing else could haue contented him, but *only* obedience: then it had beene a vaine thing to haue prescribed a determinate penalty. But when as a penalty is limited in case of disobedience, 'tis manifest that though the intent of the Law-giuer was in the first place for obedience; yet in the next place it should suffice, if there were satisfaction by bearing of the penalty.

Secondly, the good and benefit of the Law-giuer is hereby also satisfied. For it is to bee supposed in all penall lawes, that the penalty limited is every way proportionable and equivalent vnto that good, which might accrew by the obseruation of the law. Else were the wisdome of the Law-maker iustly to be taxed, as giuing an apparant encouragement to offenders; when they should see the penalty, not to be so much hurtful to them; as their disobedience were gainefull. Hee therefore that suffers the penalty is afterward to bee reckoned as if hee had kept the Law: because by his suffering, he hath aduanced the Law-giuers honour, or benefit, as much as he could by his obeying.

2 *Euangelicall*, and of *Faith*, which is such a conformity to Gods Law as is not inherent in our own persons; but being in another is imputed vnto vs & reckoned ours. The righteousnesse of the Law, and of the Gospell, are not two seuerall kinds of righteousnesse; but the same in regard of the matter and substance thereof: only they differ in the subiect and manner of application. The righteousnesse of workes is that holinesse and obedience which is inherent in our

owne perſons and performed by our ſelues: the righteouſneſſe of Faith is the ſame holineſſe and obedience inherent in the perſon of *Chriſt* and performed by him; but imbraced by our faith, and accepted by God, as done in our ſteed, and for our benefit.

Theſe are the divers acceptions of this word Iuſtice or Righteouſneſſe; ſo farre as it concernes the point in hand.

In the next place we are to enquire of this word *Iuſtification*; which being nothing but the making of a perſon iuſt or righteous, may be taken in a double ſenſe. For a perſon is made iuſt either by *Infuſion*, or *Apologie*. We will take it in theſe tearmes for want of better.

1 1 *Iuſtification* by *Infuſion*, is then, when the *habituall quality* of *Righteouſneſſe* and *Holineſſe* is wrought in any perſon by any meanes whatſoeuer; whether it bee created and infuſed into him by the worke of another; or obtained by his owne art and induſtry. Thus *Adam* was made iuſt. *Eccleſ.* 7. 29 God hauing giuen vnto him in his creation the inherent qualities of Iuſtice and holineſſe. Thus alſo the regenerate are made iuſt, in as much as by the holy Ghoſt, they are ſanctified through the reall infuſion of grace into their ſoules; in the which they increaſe alſo more and more, by the vſe of exerciſe and all good meanes.

2 2 *Iuſtification*, by *Apologie* is, when a perſon accuſed as an offender is iudicially or otherwiſe acquitted and declared to be innocent of the fault: and ſo free from the puniſhment. When the innocency of a party accuſed is thus pleaded & declared; he is thereby ſaid to be iuſtified, or made iuſt: according as, on the contrary by accuſation and condemnation, a party is ſaid to be made vniuſt. As 'tis plaine by that of *Iſaiah*, 5. 23. [*They iuſtifie the wicked for a reward: and take away the righteouſneſſe of the righteous from him*] that is

is,they condemne the righteous,which is a making of them vnrighteous in the sight and estimation of men. So in 1.*Ioh.* 5.10. [*He that beleeueth not God,hath made him a lier*] because vnbeleeuers doe in their hearts call Gods truth into question: and accuse him to be false of his word. So againe, *Psal.*109.7. [*when he is iudged, let him bee condemned.*] יצא רשע. *Let him goe out a wicked person.* For so his condemnation makes him (that is) declares him to be. But here further it must be obserued, that this *Iustification* of a person, by pleading to, and absolution in iudgement,is of two sorts;according as the persons to bee iustified, are likewise of two seuerall conditions.

1 Some are truely and inherently iust, being no Transgressors of the law; either at all;or not in that whereof they are accused. In this case if any crime, or suspition of crime, be laid to their charge; they are iustified; either by a plaine deniall of the fact, alleaging that the fault whereof they are accused,was neuer by them committed; or by denying the euill of the fact, alleaging that in so doing they haue done well,because they haue done what the law commanded; & thats their warrant. Thus *Samuel* iustifies his gouernment against all surmise offraudulent and wrongfull dealing,that the people might imagine by him, in 1.*Sam.*12.3.&c. Thus *David* cleares himselfe before God, from that crime of conspiracie against *Saul* his Master, and seeking of the kingdome(which *Cush* and other Courtiers accused him of) professing his innocency;and desiring God to iudge him according to his righteousnesse and integrity in that behalfe: as it is *Psal.*7.3.4.8. There need not other instances in so plain a matter. Those that are iustified by this meanes are iustified by that Righteousnesse which is of the *Law* and of *workes.* By which plea though man may bee iustified before man:

yet in the sight of God no flesh liuing shall be iustified. As hereafter we shall see.

2 Some are not truly righteous in themselues: but are in their own persons transgressors of the law. These (when they are accused) haue no other meanes whereby they may be iustified, but by confessing the crime, and pleading *satisfaction*: that for their transgression against the Law, and offence thereby against the Law-giuer, they haue fully satisfied by doing or suffering some such thing, as by way of iust penalty hath beene required of them. Now hee that can plead such a full and perfect satisfaction, ought therefore to be accounted innocent, and free from all desert of further punishment (for tis supposed he hath endured the vtmost of evill the Law could inflict:) and so he is to bee esteemed of, as if he had not at all violated the law. For plenary satisfaction for a fault, and the *non-Commission* of such a fault, are of equall iustice: & deserue alike iustification. In which point, it must bee noted, that if the party offended doe pardon without any satisfaction taken, there the offender is not iustified at all. And againe if the offence bee such, as there can be no satisfaction made: then it is vtterly impossible that the offender should euer bee iustified. Now this satisfaction which an offender may plead for his iustification, is threefold.

1 That which is made by himselfe in his owne person. He that can plead this kind of satisfaction, is iustified *Legally* by his own righteousnesse and merits.

2 That which is made by another for him; When another by consent and approbation of the party offended, interposeth himselfe as *surety* for the party delinquent, in his steed and name to make that *satisfaction*, which is required of the party himselfe. Whether this be done by doing or suffering

suffering the same things which the delinquent should haue done or suffered, or some other things but of equivalent worth and dignity. Hee that pleads this kinde of satisfaction, is iustified Evangelically by grace, through the righteousnesse of another imputed to him, and accepted for as his.

3 That which is made partly by himselfe and partly by another. Which kinde of satisfaction may haue place betweene Man and Man: but betweene God and man it hath none at all. Neither by this, nor by that first kinde of *satisfaction* which is done in our owne persons, can any man be iustified in the sight of God, but only by the second sort, that *satisfaction* which is made by another for vs. As wee shall see afterwards.

CHAP. II.

In what sense the word Iustification ought to be taken in the present controuersie, and of the difference betweene vs and our Aduersaries therein.

HAuing thus distinguished of these words, it followeth that in the first place, we enquire in which of the fore-named senses wee are to take this word *Iustification*. The difference betweene vs and our aduersaries of the Romish Church, is in this point very great and irreconcileable. They affirme that *Iustification* is to be taken in the first acception, for making of a Man iust by infusion of Reall Holinesse into him. So that with them to iustifie, beares the same sense as to *purifie* or *sanctifie*: that is of a person vncleane, vnholy, vniust, to make him formally or inherently *Pure*, *Holy*, and *Iust*, by working in him the inherent qualities of *Purity*, *Sanctity* and *Righteousnesse*.

We

We on the contrary teach according to the Scriptures; That *Iustification*, is to be taken in the second acception, for the pleading of a persons innocency called into question: whereby he is iudicially absolued and freed from fault and punishment. So that with vs to justifie a person is in iudiciall proceeding to acquit him of the crime whereof he is accused, and to declare him free from desert of punishment. Whether of vs twaine be in the right is very materiall to be determined of, considering that all ensuing disputation touching the *Iustification* of a sinner is to be framed vpon one of these grounds, rightly taken; and an errour here is like a threed misplaced at first, that runs awry afterward through the whole peece. Our adversaries plead for their assertion: the *Etymology* of the word *iustificare* is *iustum facere*, in that sense (say they) as *Purificare*, *Mortificare*, *Vivificare*, & many the like signifie to make pure, to make dead or aliue, by the reall induction of such and such Qualities.

Againe, they alleadge *Scriptures*; as namely *Dan.* 12.3. [*They that turne many to righteousnesse (Heb. that iustifie many) shall shine as the Starres for euer*] *Apoc.* 22.11. [*Hee that is righteous (iustificetur) Let him be righteous still.*] *Tit.* 3.7. [*He hath saued vs by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghost,---That being iustified by his grace we should be made Heires according to the hope of eternall life.*] Againe, 1. *Cor.* 6.11. [*And such were some of you: but yee are washed, but yee are sanctified, but yee are iustified, in the name of the Lord Iesus, and by the Spirit of our God.*] Out of these with some other places (but such as haue scarce any shew of good proofe) they would faine conclude, that by *Iustification* nothing else is meant, but the *Infusion* of the *Habite* of *Iustice* into him, that was before sinfull and vniust.

Rom. 8.30. Heb. 9.

Hereto

Hereto we answer. 1. First for the *Etymology* that the signification of words is to be ruled, not by Etymologies: but by the common vse: 1

Quem penes arbitrium est & vis & norma loquendi

as the Poet truely defines. Now its a thing notorious that in the custome of all languages, this word *Iustificare* imports nothing but the declaration of the Innocency of a person; and lawfulnesse of any fact: against such accusations as implead either of vniustice or wrong. I will iustifie such a man or such a matter (say we in English) and what Englishman vnderstands thereby any thing but this. I will make it appeare such a man is honest, such a fact lawfull, howeuer questioned to the contrary. In other languages my skill serues me not, nor is it needfull to trouble you with instances. Those that haue written of this subiect of euery Nation, witnesse every one for their owne language. And further this word *Iustificare* being of a latter stamp, vnknowne to such Latine Authors, as are of ancient and purer Language, fitted by Ecclesiasticall writers to expresse the meaning of those two words of the Originall הצדיק and δικαιοῦν; it is apparent the Copy must follow the Originall, and the Latine word beare the same sense as the Hebrew & Greeke words doe. And that this is that legall sense which we haue spoken of is a point so manifest throughout the whole Bible: that nothing but impudency can deny it. As we shall presently perceiue.

For in the next place. 2 As to the Scriptures which they alleadge for proofe of their interpretation of the word: We answere: That of a multitude of places of Scripture, where- 2
in the word Iustifie is vsed, our aduersaries may truely picke 1
out one, or two, or three that seeme to fauour their assertion of *Infusion* of *habituall Iustice*: yet haue they gained little

thereby. For where tenne or more may be alleadged against one in which the contrary signification is vsed, reason tells vs, that an Article and Doctrine of religion ought to bee framed out of the signification of words and phrases, which is vsuall, ordinary, and regular; and not out of that which sometimes comes in by way of particular exception. Might he not be iudged destitute of sense and modesty, that would quarrell at the signification of the word *Ecclesia*, that in the new Testament it is not taken for the company and assembly of the faithfull, because in a place or two (as *Act.* 19) it is taken for any ordinary ciuill meeting of people together? Wherefore we may grant them (הצדיק in that of *Dan.*12.) and (δικαιῶν in *Apoc.*22.) is to be made iust, *formaliter*, by *infusion* of inherent holinesse in a sinner. For so Ministers may be said to *iustifie* many (as it is in *Daniel*) *viz.* by their Ministery turne many to righteousnesse, directing them to the meanes of Holinesse, and as Gods Instruments, working in them the graces of conuersion and regeneration. And so he that is iust (in the *Apoc.*) may be iustified still: (that is) encrease in the inward habit and outward exercise of holinesse more and more. Thus wee may yeeld them in these two places without seeking to other interpretations further off. And yet will this be no preiudice to our doctrine grounded vpon the other signification so generally vsed.

2 *Lib.1. de Iust. cap.1.

We answere, that of all those other places alleaged by *Bell.* and *Becanus*,* there is not any one that doth necessarily enforce such a meaning of the word; as he and his fellowes stand for. These aboue the rest haue most appearance, namely, 1.*Cor.*6.*&Tit.*3.*Rom.*8.30. where *Iustification* is, say they confounded as one and the same with *Sanctification & Regeneration.* Wherevnto I answere that they doe ill to confound those things that the Apostle hath distinguished very plainely.

1 See Luke 18. 14. This man went downe to his house iustified rather then the other His praier was for pardon. God be mercifull, &c. For he went home iustified (*i.e.*) pardoned and absolued rather then the Pharisee.

plainely. He tells the *Corinthians*, that the vnrighteous shall not inherit the kingdome of God, and that themselues had beene such, euen of the most notorious ranck: but now they were washed, sanctified and *Iustified*. By three words the *Apostle* expresseth the change of their former condition. One *Metaphoricall (yee are washed)* The meaning whereof he declareth in two proper words following. [*yee are Sanctified*] thats one degree of washing or clensing from the corruption of *Nature* (in part) by the [*Spirit of our God*] of whom is the gift of inherent grace. And [*yee are iustified*] thats another sort of washing, from the guilt of *Sinne* (in the whole) [*in the name of the Lord Iesus*] that is, by the Righteousnesse and *Merits of Iesus Christ*. Nothing can bee more perspicuous and elegant. That place to *Tit. Chap.* 3. is also as plaine. *God (saith the Apostle)* speaking of the Heires and sonnes of God *in Christ)* (hath saued vs [*not by any workes of ours: but by his owne mercy, ver.* 5.] This salvation is set forth to vs in the Meanes and in the End. The meanes are two, *Regeneration* and *Iustification*. [*Hee hath saued vs by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghost*] This is the first meanes (*viz.*) Regeneration expressed, 1. by its properties or parts, 1. *Washing* or doing away of the filthy qualities of our corrupted nature. 2. *Renewing*, the Inuesting of it with new qualities of Graces and Holinesse. 1

2 By the cause efficient the *Holy Ghost* [whom he hath shed on vs abundantly] or richly, following the *Metaphore*, comparing the *Holy Ghost* in this operation to water powred out. 2 The Meritorious cause of it [*Through Iesus Christ our Saviour*] who hath procured the sending downe of the [*Holy Ghost*] into the hearts of the elect. ver. 6. This is one step to heauen, our regeneration, but it is imperfect & can- 2

Which is referred, *ad gratiam Regenerationis*.

not abide the seuerity of Gods Iudgements: now wee must be absolutely free from all fault and guiltinesse before wee can haue hope of obtaining eternall life: Therefore followes the other meanes of saluation (*viz.*) our *Iustification*, by the free grace of God which vtterly frees vs from all blame whatsoeuer, both of obedience to the law and satisfaction for sinnes against the law; that thus being regenerate and iustified we might obtaine the end of our salvation, eternall life.

3 *Tom. 2. tract. 4. cap 2. Parag. 6.* The third place is that [*Rom.* 8. 30. *Whom God hath predestinated, those he hath called, whom called, iustified; whom iustified glorified*] In this place *Becanus* triumphs. For (saith he) The Apostle here describing the order of mans saluation, first in Gods decree; then in the Execution of it by three degrees of *Vocation*, *Iustification*, and *Glorification*: it followes necessarily from thence; that either *Sanctification* is left out: or that it is confounded with one of those three degrees named. Tis a desperate shift to say that *Sanctification* is signified by *Vocation* or *Glorification*: therefore it must be the same with *Iustification*; And this cannot be avoided by any *Elusion*. We leaue shifts to the *Iesuits*, returning him to this place, this plaine direct answere. That *Sanctification* is here comprised in the word *Vocation*. For whereas the links of this golden chaine are inseparable, and all those that are called must needs be iustified and glorified: by *vocation* must here be meant that calling which is inward and effectuall, not that alone which is outward by the externall Ministery of the Word. For all that are thus called, bee not iustified, as is apparent; and againe, some, as infants, are iustified that are not capable of such a calling. But now; wherein stands the inward *vocation* of a sinner? Is it not in the infusion of inherent sanctifying grace, enlightning his eyes, opening

ning his eare, changing his Heart, turning him from darknes to light, from the power of Satan, to the obedience of God; in a word, in the renouation of his *Faculties?* Which what is it else but *Sanctification?* or *Regeneration?* or *Conuersion?* Only stiled by that tearme of *Vocation* in regard of the meanes whereby it is ordinarily effected (that is) the preaching of the word. He must needs coyne vs some new *Mystery* in *Diuinity:* who will perswade vs that some other worke of Grace is meant by *Vocation*; and not that of *Sanctification.* Therefore we haue neither one Linke snapt out, nor two shufled together in this Chaine of our *Saluation:* But foure, as distinct, as vndivideable. *Election, Sanctification,* (whereto we are called by the Gospell preached, 2. *Thes.* 2.14. *Iustification* by Faith, (which is a fruit of *Sanctification*) and *Glorification.*

The fourth place is that in the Epistle to the *Hebrewes,* Chap.9.13.14. [*For if the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer, sprinkling them that are vncleane, sanctifieth as touching the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternall Spirit offered himselfe without fault to God, purge our consciences from dead workes, to serue the liuing God.*]

Hence they argue; That as the Leviticall Sacrifices & washings did sanctifie the flesh from outward Legall impurity: so the Sacrifice of *Christ* doth purge the conscience from inward spirituall vncleanenesse of dead Workes or Sinnes.

This purging of the conscience is nothing, but iustification of a sinner. Wherefore ἁγιάζειν, καθαρίζειν and δικαιοῦν bee all of one meaning.

To which I answere, that the Apostle in that Chapter, & the next disputing of the vertue & efficacy of Christs death farre exceeding the force of all Leviticall Sacrifices (the sha-

dowes of it) ascribes vnto it what could not bee effected by those, *(viz.)* eternall Redemption [*vers.*12.] purging of the conscience from dead workes [*verse* 12.] the putting away of sinne, [*verse* 26.] The sanctification of the Elect, [*Chap.* 10. 7.10.] made *Heires* according to the hope of eternall life. In neither then of those places is our sanctification confounded with our iustification: but both distinctly declared, as two seuerall parts of grace and meanes of the accomplishment of our eternall happinesse. 'Tis scarce worth the labour to examine those other Scriptures produced by our Aduersaries, whereof some part doe directly crosse, & the rest doe but only in appearance confirme their assertion. In generall therefore for them, thus much we confidently affirme, that let the Concordance be studied, and all those places examined wherein either [הצדיק] is vsed in the old or [δικαιῶν] in the new Testament: there will not one be found, no not one, in which those words carry any other meaning, then that which we stand for *(viz.)* the clearing of a parties innocence questioned as faulty, and blameworthy. Take a taste of some places.

Rom.6.7. [δεδικαίωται] *significat liberatur: sed sensus loci discrimen indicat.*

1 1 *Iustification* is sometimes applied to *God*, when Man iustifies God. As *Psalm.* 51. 4. *Rom.*3.4. [*That thou mightest be iustified* [δικαιωθῇς] *in thy saying, & mightest ouercome when thou art iudged*] *Mat.*11.19. [*And wisdome is iustified* [ἐδικαιώθη] *of her children*] *Luke* 7.35. *Luke* 7.29. [*And the Publicans iustified* [ἐδικαίωσαν] *God, being baptized with the baptisme of Iohn.*] Can there be any other meaning of iustification here: but this onely? That God is then iustified, when his workes, his wisdome, his sacred ordinances, being accused by prophane men, as vntrue, vnequall, vniust, and foolish, are by the Godly acknowledged, or any other meanes evidently cleared vnto all men,

to

to be full of all truth, equity, wisdome, and holinesse?

2 Man and that 2

1 Before man in things betweene man and man. When man iustifies man, *Deut.*25.1. [*If there be a controversie betweene men, and they come vnto iudgement, that the Iudge may iudge them, then they shall iustifie* [הצדיקו] *the righteous and condemne the wicked*] *Isaiah*,5.23. [*Woe to them which iustifie the wicked for a reward, and take away the righteousnesse of the righteous from him*] *Proverb.* 17. 15. [*He that iustifieth the wicked, & condemneth the iust, euen they both are an abomination to the Lord.*] 2.*Sam.*15.4. [*Oh that I were made Iudge in the land, that euery man that hath any suit or cause, might come to me, and I would doe him iustice.* [ויהצדיקהו] In these and many the like places, to *Iustifie* is in iudiciall proceeding to absolue a party from fault and blame: whether it bee rightfully or wrongfully done. *Ezek.*16.52. [*Be thou confounded and beare thy shame, in that thou hast iustified thy sisters*] speakes God vnto *Ierusalem*; in comparison of whose abomination the sinnes of *Sodome* and *Samaria*, were scarce to be accounted any faults. They were Saints to her. Of the Pharisees *Christ* speakes, *Luke* 16.15. [*Yee are they that iustifie your selues before men: but God knoweth your hearts.*] That is, You stand vpon the defence and ostentation of outward Holinesse, and deeming it sufficient to make it appeare before men you are holy: without regard of acquitting the syncerity of your hearts before God. 1

2 Before God, where God iustifies man *Exod.*23.7. [*The innocent and the righteous slay thou not, for I will not iustifie the wicked.*] by esteeming him as innocent, & letting him goe from punishment. *Isaiah* 50.8, [*He is neere that iustifieth me, who will contend with me?*] saith the Prophet 2

in

in the person of Christ, signifying God would make it appeare that he was blamelesse, for the reiection of his people the Iewes who perished for their owne and not his fault. *Rom.* 5. 18. [*As by the offence of one iudgement came on all men to condemnation: So by the righteousnesse of one, the free gift came vpon all men to the Iustification of life*] *Rom.* 8. 33. 34. [*Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that iustifies; who shall condemne?* 1. *Cor.* 4. 4. [*I knowe nothing by my selfe: yet in this am I not iustified. Hee that iudgeth me is God.* q.d. I haue kept a good conscience in my Ministery, but God is my iudge, though my conscience pronounce me innocent, yet God is my sole Iudge that iudgeth me and my conscience. *Acts*, 13. 38. 39. [*Through this man is preached vnto you the forgiuenesse of sinnes; and from all things from which yee could not be iustified by the Law of Moses; by him every one that beleeueth is iustified.*

By which places (not to name more) it appeares plainely that iustification is opposed to accusation and condemnation: and therefore can signifie nothing else but the defence and absolution of a person accused for an offender. Which thing is so cleere and evident that it cannot bee gaine-said, except by those alone who are wilfully blinde, and obstinatly resolued to contradict any truth, that makes against their inveterate errours. For our selues, we may not, nor dare not shut our eyes against so cleere light: nor ought we to be so bold when God hath acquainted vs with his meaning; as to follow another of our owne making. And therefore according to the Scriptures we acknowledge and maintaine, that as in other places where mention is made of the iustification of a sinner before God: so in the 2 and 4 Chapters of the Epist. to the Rom. and third Chapter of the Gal. (where the Doctrine thereof is directly handled) by *Iustification* nothing

thing else is meant; but the gracious act of Almighty God whereby he absolues a beleiuing sinner accused at the Tribunall of his Iustice, pronouncing him iust and acquitting him of all punishment for *Christs* sake.

CAP. III.

The Confutation of our Aduersaries cauills against our acception of the word Iustification.

OVR Adversaries haue little to reply against these so plaine places. Somthing they answer, namely. *Becanus Ibid. Sect.8.*

1 That it cannot be denied but that *Iustification*, doth many times beare that sense we stand for. But with all they would haue vs obserue this rule that [*Quotiescunq; in Scripturis Deus dicitur iustificare impium: semper intelligendum est ex impio facere iustum. God cannot declare a man to be iust: but of vniust hee must make him iust.*] And they giue the reason. Because the iudgement of God is according to truth, *Rom.2.2.* Wee embrace this Rule and the reason of it, acknowledging that where euer there is *Iustification*, there must be iustice some way or other in the party iustified. But the question stands still in what manner *God* makes a sinner iust: whom hee in iudgement pronounceth so to be. They say by bestowing on him the grace of *Sanctification and perfect righteousnesse* inherent in his owne person. We affirme, that it is by imputing vnto him the *perfect righteousnesse of Christ*, accepting *Christs* obedience for his. In which diuersity let vs come as neere them as truth will giue leaue. Thus farre wee goe along with them. 1

1 That there is inherent righteousnesse bestowed vpon a sinner, whereby of vnholy, impure, vniust; he is made holy, 1

cleane, and iuſt. Wee all confeſſe this worke of the *Holy Ghoſt* renewing man in the ſpirit of his minde, reſtoring in him the [a] image of God in [a] knowledge, righteouſneſſe, and holineſſe. That the *Holy Ghoſt* dwels in the elect, as in [b] Temples dedicated to his ſeruice, which hee adornes by communicating vnto them his heauenly graces. That hee makes them liuing [c] members of Chriſts body: and fruitfull [d] branches of that true Vine. That this grace infuſed is a fountaine of [e] liuing water ſpringing vp to eternall life. Theſe things we beleeue and teach.

[a] Eph.4.24. Col.3.9.
[b] 1.Cor.3.16. & 6.19. 2.Cor.6.16. Rom 8.
[c] Rom.12.5. 1.Cor.12.11.
[d] Ioh.15.4.
[e] Ioh.4.14.

Wherefore whereas the Popiſh Doctors fall foule on our reformed writers, charging *Calvin* and others for denying all inherent righteouſneſſe in Beleeuers, and maintaining only an imputed righteouſneſſe without them: Wee tell them 'tis a groſſe calumny forged by perverſe mindes, that liſt not to vnderſtand mens plaineſt writings. Nor *Calvin*, nor any that ever maintained the truth with him, euer denied the *Righteouſneſſe* of *Sanctification*. But this hee holds and we alſo with the Scriptures, that the righteouſnes which iuſtifies vs in Gods iudgement is not in our ſelues: but all in *Chriſt*.

Cal.Inſtit. lib.3. cap.11.

2 That inherent righteouſneſſe or ſanctification alway keep company with *Iuſtification*, in the ſame perſon. Seuered they are neuer in their common ſubiect (*viz*) a true beleeuer; as appeares *Rom.*8.30. But that therefore they muſt be confounded for one and the ſame grace and worke of God; may be affirmed with as good reaſon: as that in the Sunne light and heat are all one: becauſe alwaies ioined together.

Rom.8.30.

3 That by this grace of inherent righteouſneſſe, a man is in ſome ſort iuſtified before God. That is ſo farre as a man by the grace of God is become truly holy and good: ſo far God eſteemes him holy and good. God taketh notice of his owne

owne graces in his children, he approues of them and giues testimony of them in case it be needfull; as appeares by the righteousnesse of *Iob*, *David*, *Zachary*, and other holy men; who were good and did good in Gods sight. Yea in the life to come when (all corruptions being vtterly done away.) the Saints shall bee inuested with perfection of inherent holinesse: by the *Righteousnesse* of their owne, and not by any other shall they then appeare iust in Gods sight.

Thus farre we agree with them. But herein now wee differ, that although by the grace of Sanctification infused, God doe make him righteous & holy in some measure that was before altogether vnholy and wicked: neuertheless we affirme that by and for this holinesse, the best of Saints liuing neuer were nor shall be iustified in Gods sight; that is pronounced iust and innocent before the Tribunall of his Iustice. For we here take vp the forenamed rule laied down by our aduersaries, *Whomsoeuer God pronounceth to bee perfectly iust; hee must needs be made perfectly iust.* For Gods iudgement is according to truth. Now that no man in this life, is made perfectly iust by any such inherent holinesse in him as is able to outstand the seuere and exact triall of Gods iudgment: is a truth witnessed by the Scripture and confessed alwaies by the most holy Saints of God. Our aduersaries indeed stifly plead the contrary: teaching that sinne and corruption in the iustified is vtterly abolished. The error & pride of which imagination wee shall shortly haue occasion more at large to discouer vnto you. Meane while let thus much stand for good: that man being not made perfectly iust in himselfe cannot thereby be declared perfectly iust before God: and therefore some other righteousnesse, & not that of Sanctification is to be sought for, whereby a sinner may be iustified in Gods sight. 1

2 To that argument of ours from the opposition of iustification to accusation and condemnation confirmed by so many places of Scripture; They answere. That this hinders nothing at all, both may agree to God who of his mercy iustifies some; (that is) makes them inherently iust; of his iustice condemnes other (that is) punisheth them. To which slight answers we make this short reply. That where words are opposite, (as they acknowledge these to be) there according to the lawes of opposition, they must carry opposite meaning. But vnto accusation, condemnation, and punishment nothing is opposite but defence, absolution, and pardon. Where therefore *Iustificare* is coupled with these words; it must needs beare this and no other meaning: of a bad man to make a good is not opposite to accusation, condemnation, or punishment of him: accused he may bee, condemned and punished iustly, and after made good.

Bec. Ibid. Parag 9.

I should but trouble you to alleage more of their cavills. Let thus much suffice for the clearing of this point: That iustification and sanctification are to be distinguished and not confounded. The righteousnesse of the one is in vs, in its nature, true and good: but for its degree and measure, imperfect, and alwaies yoaked with the remainder of naturall corruption. And therefore if a sinner should plead this before the iudgement seat of God, (offering himselfe to bee iudged according to this righteousnesse and innocency) oh how soone his mouth would be stopped; and this confession wrung from out of his conscience; All my righteousnesse is as filthy ragges! And againe *Vilis sum*; I am vile, what shall I answer thee! But that other righteousnesse of iustification is without vs in Christs possession: but ours by Gods gratious gift and acception, & this is every way perfect and vnreproued in the seuerest iudgement of God. And therefore

fore when a sinner is drawne before the bar of Gods iudgement, accused by the law, Satan, his conscience; convicted by the evidence of the fact, and to be now sentenced and deliuered to punishment by the vnpartiall iustice of God: In this case he hath to alleage for himselfe the allsufficient righteousnesse of a mighty Redeemer, who only hath done and suffered for him that which hee could neuer doe nor suffer for himselfe. This plea alone and no other in the world, can stop vp the mouth of Hell, confute the accusations of Satan, chase away the Terrors that haunt a guilty conscience, and appease the infinite indignation of an angry Iudge. This alone will procure fauour and absolution in the presence of that Iudge of the whole world. This alone brings downe from heauen into our consciences that blessed peace, which passeth all vnderstanding; but of him that hath it. Whereby we rest our selues secure from feare of condemnation; being provided of a defence that will not faile vs, when after death we shall come into iudgement.

SECT. 2. CHAP. I.

The Orthodox opinion concerning the manner of Iustification by Faith, and the confutation of Popish errours in this point.

HAuing thus cleared the meaning of this word [*Iustification*] and shewed that the Scriptures, when they speake of the Iustification of a sinner before God, doe thereby vnderstand the absolution of him in iudgement from sinne and punishment. We are now vpon this ground to proceed vnto the further explication of this point, to enquire by what meanes & in what manner, this iustification of a sinner is accomplished. That *Sect.2.c.1.*

we may goe on more distinctly: I will reduce all our ensuing discourse of this point into three heads.

3 Gen. Heads. First, touching the condition required in them that shall
1 be iustified.

2 Secondly, the matter of our Iustification. (*viz.*) What righteousnesse it is wherefore a sinner is iustified.

3 Thirdly; touching the forme of iustification, in what the quality of this judiciall act of God, justifying a sinner,
1 consisteth.

Genera head Concerning the first at this time. The condition required in such as shall bee partakers of this grace of justification is true faith, wherevnto God hath ordinarily annexed this great priuiledge; That by faith and faith only, a sinner shall be justified: This the Scriptures witnesse in tearmes as direct and expresse, as any can be. [*Rom.*3.28. *Wee conclude a man is iustified by faith without the workes of the Law.*] and *Rom.*4.9. [*For we say that faith was imputed vnto Abraham for righteousnesse.*] and *Rom.*5.1.] *Then being iustified by faith, we haue peace towards God through Iesus Christ our Lord.*] With other the like places. Whence it is agreed vpon on all sides, that a sinner is justified by faith: but touching the manner, how he is said to be iustified by faith, there is much controuersie and brawle, betweene the orthodoxe of the reformed Churches, and their aduersaries of *Rome* and *Holland*; the *Arminians*, and the *Papists*. The sentence of the reformed Churches touching this point, consisteth of two Branches.

First, that a sinner is iustified by faith, not properly as it is a quality or action; which by it's owne dignity and merit, deserues at Gods hands remission of sinnes; or is by Gods fauorable acceptance taken for the whole & perfect righteousnesse of the Law, which is otherwise

wise required of a sinner: but only in relation vnto the object of it, the righteousnesse of Christ; which it imbraceth and resteth vpon.

Secondly, that a sinner is iustified by faith in opposition vnto the righteousnesse of workes in the fulfilling of the Law. Whereby now no man can be iustified.

In this relatiue and inclusiue sense doe the reformed Churches take this proposition [*A man is iustified by faith*] They explaine themselues thus: There are two Covenants that God hath made with man; By one of which and by no other meanes in the world, saluation is to be obtained. The one is the couenant of workes, the tenor whereof is [*Doe this and thou shalt liue.*] This couenant is now vtterly void, in regard of vs; who through the weakenesse of our sinnefull flesh cannot possibly fulfill the condition of obedience required thereby: and therefore we cannot expect iustification and life by this meanes. The other is the couenant of grace, the Tenor whereof is, Beleeue in the Lord *Iesus* and thou shalt be saued. The condition of this couenant is Faith: the performance whereof differs from the performance of the condition of that other couenant. Doe this and liue, is a compact of pure iustice wherein wages is giuen by debt, so that he which doth the work obeying the Law, may in strict iustice for the worke sake claime the wages, eternall life vpon iust desert. Beleeue this and liue is a compact of freest and purest mercy: wherein the reward of eternall life is giuen vs in favour for that which beares not the least proportion of worth with it: so that hee which performes the condition cannot yet demand the wages, as due vnto him in seuerity of iustice; but only by the grace of a free promise, the fulfilling of which he may humbly sue for. By which grand difference

ference betweene these two Couenants clearely expressed in Scriptures, it appeares manifestly that these two propositions. [*A man is iustified by workes,*] [*A man is iustified by faith,*] carry meanings vtterly opposite one to the other. The one is proper and formall: the other Metonymicall and relatiue. In this Proposition [*A man is iustified by workes*] we vnderstand all in proper and precise termes: That a righteous man who hath kept the law exactly in all points, is by and for the dignity and worth of that his obedience iustified in Gods sight from all blame and punishment whatsoeuer; becaus perfect obedience to the morall law in it selfe, for its own sake deserues the approbation of Gods seuere iustice and the reward of heauen. But in that other proposition (*A man is iustified by Faith*) Wee must vnderstand all things relatiuely thus. A sinner is iustified in the sight of God from all sinne & punishment by faith (that is) by the obedience of Iesus Christ beleeued on; and embraced by a true faith. Which act of iustification of a sinner, although it be properly the only worke of God, for the only merit of Christ: yet is it rightly ascribed vnto faith, and it alone, for as much as faith is that maine condition of that new couenant, which as we must performe if we will be iustified: so by the performance thereof wee are said to obtaine iustification and life. For when God by grace hath enabled vs to performe the condition of beleeuing; then doe we beginne to enioy the benefit of the Couenant; then is the sentence of absolution pronounced in our consciences; which shall be after confirmed in our death; and published in the last iudgement. Secondly, our faith and no other grace directly respects the promises of the Gospell; accepting what God offers, sealing vnto the truth thereof by assenting thereto, and imbracing the benefit and fruit of it vn-

to

to it selfe, by relying wholy vpon it. This interpretation of that proposition the reformed Churches doe admit, and none other: reiecting as erronious and contrary to the Scriptures such glosses as ascribe any thing to the dignitie of faith; or make any combination betweene Faith and Workes, in the point of our Iustification. Amongst which there are three erronious assertions touching mans iustification by Faith; which we are briefly to examine and refute.

1 That faith iustifieth vs [*Per modum causæ efficientis & meritoriæ*] as a proper efficient and meritorious cause. Which by it's owne worth and dignity deserues to obtaine iustification, remission of sinnes, & the grace of well doing.

This is the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which *Bellarmine* labours to proue in his 17. *Chap. lib. pr. de iustificatione*, where disputing against iustification by faith alone, hee tels vs. If we could be perswaded that faith doth iustifie [*impetrando, promerendo, & suo modo inchoando Iustificationem,*] then we would neuer deny that loue, feare, hope, and other vertues did iustifie vs as well as faith. Wherevpon hee sets himselfe to proue that there is in faith it selfe some efficacy and merit to obtaine and deserue iustification. His arguments are chiefly two.

1 From those places of Scripture, wherein a man is said to be iustified, [a] διὰ τῆ πίστως. [b] ἐκ τῆ πίστως. [c] τῇ πίστει. or absolutely without article or preposition. *πίστει per fidem, ex fide* (or) *fide*. Wherein these Prepositions signifie, saith he, the true cause of our iustification. Which hee proues, 1. By the contrary, when a man is said to be iustified [διὰ τῶν ἔργων, or τοῖς ἔργοις.] This notes the true *efficient* deseruing *cause* of his iustification. Secondly, by the like in other places where we are said to be redeemed, saued, sanctified; *Per Christum, per sanguinem, per mortem, per vulnera*; and in the whole 11

a Gal.2.16.
b Rom.5.1.
c Rom.28.
d Rom.4.2. & 3.20. Gal.2.16. Iam.2.

to the *Heb.* The Saints are said to doe such and such things (πίστει) by faith. All signifying the *proper cause.*

2 From those places of Scripture which (saith he) plainely shew: Faith doth *impetrare remissionem, & suo quidē modo mereri.* Such are those [*Thy faith hath saued thee*] or made thee whole. A speech that *Christ* vsed often, as to the [a] woman that washed his feet; to her [b] that had an issue of blood: To the [c] blinde man recouered of his sight. And that to the *Cananitish* woman [*O woman* [d] *great is thy faith*] now see what the merit of this Faith was, (*For his* [e] *saying goe thy way the Diuell is gone out of thy daughter*) Thus Abraham, [*being* [f] *strengthned in Faith glorified God,*] who therefore iustified him for the merit of his faith. And againe in the eleuenth to the *Heb.* by many examples we are taught that by § Faith (that is) by the merit and price of Faith *Enoch* & other men pleased God.

a Luke.7.50.
b Mat.9.22.
c Mar.10.52.
d Mat.15.21.
e Mar 7.29.
f Rom.4.20.
g Heb.11.5.6.

For answere herevnto.

1 Vnto the Argument from the Proposition we reply; That if ἐκ πίστεως & ἐξ ἔργων, must bee needs strictly taken in the same kinde of causality: then the *Iesuites* should doe well to stand to that and make the similitude betweene Faith and workes runne thus. A man is iustified (*by*) workes that is for the proper and only merits of his obedience; so a man is iustified (*by*) faith, that is for the only merit of his beleeuing in Christ: and by that meanes both shall be true and effectuall causes of iustification. But if *Bellarmine* dare not thus presse the similitude for feare of being found guilty of despising the blood of the *New Couenant*, attributing that to the merit of faith which belongs only to the merit of Christ; hee must then giue vs that leaue to distinguish which he takes to himselfe: and if he fall to his *Qualifications* and *quodam modo's*: he must pardon if wee also seeke out such an interpretation

pretation of those places; as may not crosse other *Scriptures*. Which for as much as they testifie that (*We* [i] *are iustified by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ*) that (*All* [k] *sinne is purged by the blood of Christ*) that (*by the sacrifice of himselfe he hath put away sinne*) and (*with offering hath consecrated for euer them that are sanctified.*) We dare not without horrible sacriledge ascribe the grace of our iustification vnto the worke and worth of any thing whatsoeuer in our selues; but wholy and only to the Righteousnesse of Christ. And therefore when the Scriptures say we are iustified (*by*) faith; wee take not the word (*By*) in this formall and legall sense; wee are iustified by the efficacy of our faith, or for the worth of our faith, according as 'tis vnderstood in iustification by workes: but wee take it *Relatiuely and Instrumentally*: Wee are iustified by faith (that is) by the righteousnesse of Christ, the benefit whereof vnto our iustification, we are made partakers of by faith, as the only grace which accepts of the promise, and giues vs assurance of the performance. Hee that looked to the brasen Serpent and was cured, might truely bee said to bee healed (by) his looking on, though this action was no proper cause working the cure by any efficacy or dignity of it selfe; but was only a necessary condition required of them that would be healed, vpon the obedient obseruance whereof, God would shew them fauour: so he that looked on Christ beleeuing in him, may truely be said to bee saued and iustified by faith, not as for the worth, and by the efficacy of that act of his; but as it is the condition of the promise of grace, that must necessarily goe before the performance of it to vs: vpon our obedience wherevnto God is pleased of his free grace to iustifie vs. Nor is this *Trope*, any way harsh, or vnvsuall to put *Oppositum pro opposito*, *Relatum pro Correlato*,

i Rom.3.24.

k Heb.1.3.

Habitum pro Obiecto. In Sacramentall locutions 'tis a generall custome, to put the signe for the thing signified: and the like is vsed in other passages καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἠύξανε. *And the*
n Act.6.7.& 6.5. n *word of God grew, &c.* and τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως, *the* o *mystery*
o 1.Tim.3.9. & 4.6. *of faith)* and τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως, *in the words of Faith)* and Rom.8.24. [τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν. *Spe servati sumus (id est) Christo in quem speramus. Hope that is seene is not hope,* that is, *res visa non sperata est.* That of *Ignatius* [ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται] Like to that *(Christ our ioy) Anni spem credere Terra)*
Virg.Georg.2. *Georg.*1. And if we list not to bee contentious, tis plaine enough, that in those places, where the Apostle treats of Iustification by faith *(viz.)* the grace of God in Christ; opposing workes and faith, that is the law and the Gospell, the righteousnesse of the law, to the righteousnesse of the Gospell, which is no other but the righteousnes of Christ. Thus faith is taken, *Gal.*3.23. Where he expresly treats of iustifica-
p Gal.3.23. tion. But [*before faith came, we were kept vnder the Law, shut vp vnto the Faith, which should afterward be revealed*] That is, before Christ came, and the cleare exhibition of the Gospell, and the righteousnesse thereof: the Church was
q Act.13.38. kept vnder the ceremoniall law, as vnder a *Schoolmaster*, directing her vnto Christ, that so [*wee might be iustified by faith*] that is, not by the lesson of the law, but by *Christ*, typified and figured vnto vs therein.

2 Vnto the other argument prouing the merit of faith, we reply; that in those places is no ground at all for such a conceit. [*Thy faith hath saued thee,*] saith Christ to some whom he cured both in body and soule. But what? was it by the efficacy, and for the worth of their faith that this was done? No: As 'twas vertue went out of Christ that cured their bodily diseases; & his compassion that moued him to it: so 'twas his grace and merits and free loue that healed

their

their soules; and brought them pardon of their sinnes in the sight of God: Yet he saith; their faith saued them, because by beleeuing the sonne of God, they receaued this fauour, though for their beleeuing they did not deserue it. God bestowes mercy where he finds faith, not because faith merits such fauour at his hands: but because hee is pleased to dispense his fauours in such an order, as himselfe hath appointed; and vpon such conditions as he thinkes good. To that of the *Canaanitish* woman: Her great faith could not claime by desert, that fauour which Christ shewed vnto her daughter: only Christ was pleased to honour her faith by his testimony of it; & to helpe the daughter at the mothers entreaty. Christ did it vpon that request of hers so instant & full of faith; But yet who can say shee merited ought at Christs hands by that her faithfull and instant petition? Her selfe yet liuing would deny it; and she doth deny it there, counting her selfe a dogge vnworthy of the childrens bread, when yet she beleeued strongly, and was a child of *Abraham* according to the faith. To that of *Abraham* who gaue glory to God, and of *Henoch* and others, who pleased God by their faith: We answere; that it is one thing for a man to glorifie and please God by his obedience; 'tis another, by so doing to deserue ought at his hands. If God in much grace and fauour accept of the honour and contentment we are able to doe him by our faith & obedience: It follows not that therefore wee must in iustice merit at his hands. Other arguments for them there are: but so weakly knit; they fall in sunder of themselues. Against them wee haue to obiect the Scriptures, that so often say, [*We are iustified*] *gratiâ & gratis*; and the Councell of *Trent*, which they respect more then the Scriptures, which hath defined thus: *Nihil eorum quæ Iustificationem præcedunt, siue fides, siue*

opera, ipsam iustificationis gratiam promeretur, Sess.6.cap.8. How then can they say Faith merits iustification.

Here our aduersaries haue two shifts to run vnto, whereby they would avoid the absurdity of this Assertion.

1 That this merit is not from vs: but of God. Because Faith is the gift of Gods grace; and therefore though we be iustified by merit: yet we are iustified by grace, because merit is of grace. 'Tis of grace that our faith merits.

This you may be sure, is some of that smeake of the bottomelesse pit, wherein hell vented out the *Iesuites*, and they their darke imaginations; all to confound whatsoeuer is cleare and lightsome in Scripture. Scripture oppoſeth these paires; *Grace* and *Nature*, *Grace* and *Merit*. As the *Pelagians* of old confounded nature and grace, teaching that wee were saued by grace: yet affirming that we are also saued by nature, and the naturall strength of free-will. Which they salued thus. To be saued by nature, is to bee saued by grace: for nature is of Gods grace and giuing. So these confound grace and merit, making a thing meritorious, because tis of grace. Faith merits because its Gods gracious gift. Nothing more contradictory. If it be his gift, how doth it merit, or of whom? of man it may, of God it cannot: vnlesse wee will sensleſly affirme, that the gift deserues something of the giuer. That he that giues an hundred pound freely, is thereby bound to giue an hundred more. Had they said that faith is good, because of Gods giuing; that were true, and wee may grant them that God is honoured and pleased with his own gifts: but that every good thing merits, and that we can deserue of God by his owne gifts, is affirmed without all reason, or scriptures; and will neuer be proued by either.

Rom.11.6.

But there is yet another shift.

2 Faith merits iustification [*Non de condigno*] not of the worthinesse

worthinesse of it: but [*de Congruo*] of the fitnesse: that is, God in iustice is not bound to bestow iustification where there is faith: but yet in fitnesse he ought to doe it. So that if he doe not iustifie him that beleeues: hee is likely to omit a thing very fit and agreeable. This distinction is a meere imposture and collusion, *Bellarmine* in dealing with it seemes to haue a dogge by the eares, hee is loath to loose him: yet knowes not well how to hold him. If hee bee vrged where Scriptures make any the least intimation of such a distinction: he referres you to Divines, that is, Popish *Schoole-men*, who out of their owne imagination haue forged it, and in time made it authenticall. But he sticks in the mire, when he is to shew what merit of *Condignity* and merit of *Congruity* is. Merits of condignity are workes, to which wages is due of iustice. What then are merits of congruity? Such workes whereto wages is not due by any iustice. As for example: he that labours the whole day in the Vineyard, merits a penny of condignity: because in iustice his labour is worth his hire. But he that for an houres worke, receaues a penny, hee deserues it of congruity: because though his labour bee not worth it, yet hee was promised a penny by him that set him on worke: Then which fond imagination nothing can bee more ridiculous, and contrary to common sense. For the merit of any worke is the proportionablenesse of its worth with the reward. Now in reason wherein ariseth this proportion of any worke with that reward? Stands it in the dignity of the worke it selfe; or in the compact made betweene him that worketh and him that rewardeth? It is apparent that the worke is deseruing or not-deseruing according to its owne nature, not according to a compact made. He that promiseth vnto one more for a little worke, then to another for a great deale in the same kinde: doth not by such a com-

Bell. lib. 1. de Iust. cap. 21.

pact

pact make the little labour of the one more deseruing then the others great paines. We must locke to the worke, what it is in its owne nature: and as it is of some worth or no worth, so account it deseruing or not deseruing. Wherefore when in the distinction they make some merits of condignity or worthinesse, some of congruity, or of fitnesse without worthinesse, they offend two waies, grosly against two rules of reason. First in opposing termes not opposite: Worthinesse and fitnesse: being the same, if you take them in regard of the worke. For that which deserues a reward worthily, deserues it fitly: (how else is it worthy of the reward, if the reward bee not fit for it?) and that which deserues it fitly (if it deserues) it deserues it worthily.

2 In distinguishing vpon termes that doe not *conuenire toti*. For worthinesse agrees to merit only: but fitnesse belongs to compact. So that in plainer English, the distinction runnes thus Merits or deserts, are of two sorts. Some, that are merits and doe deserue because they are worthy of a reward: others that are no merits and doe not deserue because they are not worthy of the reward, but only obtaine it, *ex Congruo*, in regard of compact and promise. For this rule is most certaine, *That a worke which deserues nothing by its owne worthinesse: can neuer deserue any thing by compact or promise*. The *Iesuits* are senseless in defending the contrary.

If (saith *Bellarmine*) a King promise a Begger 1000l. a yeare, vpon no condition, then indeed the Begger doth not deserue it. But if vpon condition hee shall doe some small matter, as that he shall come to the Court and fetch it, or bring a Posie of flowres with him, now the Begger deserues it: and he may come to the King, and tell him, he hath merited his 1000l a yeare. Euery man, but a *Iesuite*, would say 'twere extreame impudency in a Begger to make such a demand,

maunde, so derogatorily to the Kings gracious bounty. Nor can it helpe them to say, that a promise bindes vnto performance, so that God should be vniust and vntrue, if he should not bestow the reward promised, although the workes bee not equall to the reward. For Gods iustice and truth in performing his promise, doe not imply our merit in performing the condition. Wee doe not deserue by our well-doing; because God is iust in his rewarding. And the reason is manifest; Because God in making the promise, respected meerely the freenesse and bounty of his owne grace, not the worthinesse of our workes. And therefore that obligation whereby he hath tyed himselfe to performance, is founded meerely in his owne truth: not a iot in our merit. Wherefore when they tell vs, that faith merits justification [*de Congruo*] they intrap themselues in a grosse contradiction; seeing to deserue [*de Congruo*] is not to deserue at all; but only to receiue the reward by meere promise: God hauing promised to iustifie beleeuers. Thus much touching the first assertion, that Faith is the proper cause of *Iustification*, working it by its owne efficacy and merits.

CHAP. II.

The confutation of the Arminian errour, shewing that faith doth not iustifie, sensu proprio, as it is an act of ours.

THe second errour about this point is of the *Arminians*, with whom also the Papists agree: Tis this.

2 That we are iustified by faith *sensu proprio*, that is, the act of beleeuing, in that τὸ *credere*, is imputed to vs for righteousnesse, being accepted of God and accounted

vnto vs for that whole righteousnesse of the Law which we were bound to performe. So that our very Faith is that righteousnesse, for which wee are iustified in the sight of God; *non quidem merito suo: sed propter gratuitam acceptilationem Dei.*

The Authors of this opinion are *Faustus Socinus*, that vnhappy *Hereticke*, in his most blasphemous booke [*de Christo servatore:*] *and Michael Servetus a Spaniard*, in his second booke [*de Lege & Evangelio*] which errours are confuted by *Caluin* in his *Opuscula*. A stiffe defender of this opinion was *Christophorus Ostorodius* a Polonian, in his disputatione *contra Georgium Tradelij*, who for this and other pestilent errours about the Article of mans redemption, was with his companion *Andreas Vaidonitus* banished the Low Countryes where he had seated himselfe and published his opinions; *Arminius*, and his followers haue beene cheefe promoters of it. *Arminius* himselfe, as in other his opinions: so in the publishing of this vsed much closeneſſe & cunning conveyance. In his private disputations [*Tit. de iustificatione*] he seemes plainely to condemne it, saying that it is an abuse to say that *Fides est causa formalis Iustificationis*, and an errour to affirme [That Christ hath deserved, *vt fidei dignitate & merito iustificemur.*] In his publique disputations he opens himselfe somewhat plainely: yet darkely enough [*Thes.19. de Iustificat. Thes.7.*] These are his words. [*Fidei vero iustificatio tribuitur, non quod illa sit iustitia ipsa quæ rigido & seuero Dei iudicio opponi possit; quanquam Deo grata: sed quod in iudicio misericordia triumphans supra iudicium absolutionem à peccatis obtineat & gratiose in iustitiam imputetur. Cuius rei causa est tum Deus iustus & misericors, tum Christus obedientia, oblatione & intercessione suâ secundum Deum in beneplacito & mandato ipsius*]

Thes.48.2.3.

ipsius.] Here faith it selfe is imputed for righteousnesse. But tis not in Gods seuere iudgement, but in his iudgement of mercy. Faith in it selfe is not worthy: but yet Christ by his merits hath deserued that God will gratiously accept of it. This opinion published was quickly contradicted: whereupon *Arminius* makes knowne his minde in plainer termes, *In declaratione sententiæ ad ordines Holland, & Westfrisiæ* he confesseth that in the forenamed *Thesis* his meaning was, that [*ipsa fides tanquam actus iuxta Evangelij mandatum præstitus imputatur coram Deo in, siue ad iustitiam, idq; in gratiâ, cum non sit ipsamet iustitia Legis.* And in his *Responsione ad 31. Artic. art. 4.* hee brancheth out his opinion in three distinct propositions. Pag. 65.

1 *Iustitia Christi imputatur nobis.*
2 *Iustitia Christi imputatur in iustitiam.*
3 *Tò credere imputatur in iustitiam.*

The first of these Propositions, he grants: That Christs Righteousnesse is imputed to vs. The second hee denies, That Christs righteousnesse is imputed for righteousnesse. The third he grants, that the act of beleeuing is imputed for righteousnesse. Here bee mysteries in these Propositions, hereafter to be vnfolded. Wee now meddle with the last which yet is more roundly expressed by *Arminius* in his Epistle *ad Hyppolitum Leg. Princip. Pap.*] [*Ipsum Fidei actũ tò credere, dico imputari in iustitiam, idq; sensu proprio non metonymicè*] The same is the opinion of his fellowes the Remonstrants, of [c] *Vorstius*, of [d] *Peter Bertius*, of [e] *Episcopius* and the [f] rest. With whom *Bellarmine* agrees pat [*Lib. 1. de Iust. cap. 17.* When vpon that *Rom. 4.* [*His faith is imputed for righteousnesse.*] he saith thus. *Vbi ipsa fides censetur esse iustitia, ac per hoc non apprehendit fides iustitiam Christi: sed ipsa fides in Christum est iustitia.*] In summe,

c *Antibel. pap. 106.*
d *Collat. cum Sib. Lubber.*
e *Thesib. de Iustific.*
f *Remonstrant. in Col. Dephens. Art. 2. Antith. 2. (Statuimus Fidem nostram nobis imputare per obedientiam: eamq; (& nos in illa) acceptos habere.*

their opinion runnes thus. God in the legall couenant required the exact obedience of his commandement: but now in the couenant of grace, he requires faith, which in his gracious estimation stands in steed of that obedience to the morall law, which we ought to performe. Which comes to passe by the merit of Christ; for whose sake God accounts our imperfect faith to be perfect obedience. This assertion we reiect as erronious, and in place thereof wee defend this *Proposition*. God doth not iustifie a man by faith properly, imputing vnto him faith in Christ for his perfect obedience to the Law, and therefore accounting him iust and innocent in his sight. Which we proue by these Reasons.

1 We are not iustified by any worke of our owne. But beleeuing is an act of our own: Therefore by the act of beleeuing we are not iustified.

The Major is most manifest by the Scriptures, which teach that we are saued by grace, *Ephes.2.5.* [*and therefore not by the workes of Righteousnesse which we had wrought.*] *Tit.3.6.* [*For if it bee of Workes, then were grace no more grace,*] *Rom.11.6.*

The *Minor* is likewise evident. [*That faith is a worke of ours.*] For though *Ioh.6.29.* it bee said, [*This is the worke of God that yee beleeue in him whom he hath sent*] yet will not our aduersaries conclude thence, that Faith is Gods worke within vs, and not our worke by his helpe. For so should they runne into that absurdity which they would fasten vpon vs. (*viz.*) That when a man beleeues, tis not man beleeues: but God beleeues in him. To beleeue, though it be done by Gods aide: yet 'tis we that doe it; and the act is properly ours. And being so, we conclude, that by it we are not justified in Gods sight.

Here two exceptions may be made.

1 First

1 First that wee are not iustified by any worke of our owne *(viz.)* which we our selues doe by our owne strength without the helpe of grace: But yet we may be iustified by some worke which we doe *(viz.)* by the aide of grace; and such a worke is faith. We answer. This distinction of works done without grace and workes done by grace, was deuised by one that had neither wit nor grace; being a Tricke to elude the force of such Scriptures as exclude indefinitely all workes from our iustification, without distinguishing either of time when they are done, before or after; or of the ayde and helpe whereby they are done, whether by nature or by grace. Wherefore it is without all ground in *Scripture* thus to interpret these propositions: *A man* is not iustified by workes (that is) by workes done by the power of nature before and without grace. *A man* is justified by Grace (that is) by workes done by aide of grace. These interpretations are meere forged inventions of froward mindes, affirmed but not proued: as we shall more hereafter declare,

2 That we are not iustified by any workes of our own, (that is) by any workes of the Law: but by a worke of the Gospell such as faith is we may be iustified. *Male res agitur vbi opus est tot Remedijs* (saith *Erasmus* in another case.) Tis a certaine signe of an vntrue opinion when it must bee bolstered vp with so many distinctions. Nor yet hath this distinction any ground in Scripture, or in reason: for both tell vs that the workes commanded in the Law, & workes commanded in the Gospell are one and the same for the substance of them, what worke can bee named, that is inioyned vs in the new Testament, which is not also commanded vs in that summary precept of the Morall Law, [*Thou shalt loue the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soule and with all thy strength, and with all thy minde, and thy*

neighbour as thy ſelfe.] *Luc.*10.27,*De.*6.5. What ſin is there againſt the Goſpell, that is not a tranſgreſſion of the Law? If the Goſpell command charity, is it any other then that which the Law commands: If the Goſpell command faith, doth not the Law enioyne the ſame? you will ſay no. It doth not command faith in Chriſt. I anſwere, yea, it doth: For that which commands vs in generall to beleeue what euer God ſhall propoſe vnto vs: commands vs alſo to beleeue in Chriſt, as ſoone as God ſhall make knowne that tis his will we ſhould beleeue in him. The Goſpell diſcouers vnto vs the Obiect; the Law commands vs the obedience of beleeving it. Wherefore Faith, for the ſubſtance of the Grace & workes done by vs, is a worke of the law; and ſo to be iuſtified by the action of beleeuing, is to bee iuſtified by workes & by our owne righteouſneſſe, contrary to the Scriptures; and that *Phil.*3.9.(*That I may be found not, &c.* This of the firſt Reaſon.

2 2 God accounts that only for perfect *Righteouſneſſe* of the Law, which is ſo indeed and truth.
But Faith is not the perfect fulfilling of the Law.
Therefore God doth not account it for ſuch.

The Minor is granted by our adverſaries; that faith is not the exact iuſtice of the Law; ſuch as can ſtand before the ſeverity of Gods iudgements. The Major muſt bee proued: that God accounts not that for perfect iuſtice which is not perfect indeed. This appeares by that *Rom.*2.2 [*The iudgement of God is according to truth.*] Where therefore any thing is not truely good and perfect: there God eſteemes it not ſo. Here alſo twill be excepted.

That God ſometime iudgeth *Iudicio iuſtitiæ*, according to exact iuſtice; and then he iudgeth nothing perfectly iuſt, but that which hath true perfection of Iuſtice in it. Sometimes

times he iudgeth *iudicio misericordiæ*; according to mercy: and so he may esteeme a man perfectly righteous for that which is not perfect righteousnesse in it selfe; namely for his Faith.

Surely, this is a trimme distinction thus applyed, that sets Gods mercy and truth together by the eares. As who would say, when God iudgeth out of mercy: hee then doth not iudge according to truth. The Scriptures doe not acquaint vs with any such mercifull iudgement of God. This they doe acquaint vs with, that God iudgeth according to mercy, not when he doth pronounce and cleare a sinner to be perfectly righteous for that righteousnesse which is truly imperfect: but when he iudgeth a sinner to be righteous for that righteousnesse which is perfect; but is not his owne. In this iudgement there is both truth and mercy. Truth, in that he esteemes me perfectly righteous, for that righteousnesse sake which is euery way perfect: and mercy, that he accepteth for sinne, that righteousnesse which is performed for me by Christ my surety; but is not mine owne. Other mercifull iudgement of God besides this, we acknowledge none.

3 We are not iustified by two righteousnesses existing in two divers subiects. But if we be iustified by the worke of faith: we shall be iustified partly by that righteousnesse which is in vs, (*viz.*) of faith: partly by the righteousnesse of Christ without vs. 3

Ergo we are not iustified by faith properly.

The minor is apparent. The righteousnesse of faith is inherent in vs, and by it we are iustified (say our aduersaries.) The righteousnesse of Christ is inherent in him: and by it are we iustified, say the Scriptures. [*Being now iustified by his blood, we shall be saued from wrath through him.*] *Rom.* 5. 9. & *v.* 19. [*By the obedience of one, many shall be made iust.*]

Wherefore

Wherefore either wee are properly iustified by both, or there is an errour, and one part must stand out. We cannot be properly iustified by both, for our owne faith & Christs obedience too: for if we be perfectly iust in Gods sight for our owne faith, what need the imputation of *Christs* obedience to make vs iust? If for Christs righteousnesse we be perfectly iustified: how can God account vs perfectly iust for our faith? *Arminius* and his friends, seeing these things cannot stand together; haue (according to the good will which they beare toward the righteousnesse of Christ) kept in our faith, and thrust out Christs obedience, denying vtterly that it is imputed vnto vs for righteousnesse. But my brethren, (which I hope make a better choice) seeing it cannot part with ours: let vs part with our owne righteousnes, leaning wholy vpon the righteousnesse of Christ; and seeking for the comfort of our iustification in his perfect obedience, and not in our weake and imperfect faith. These reasons may suffice to shew the errour of that assertion. Wee are iustified by faith, *sensu proprio*, God accepting the act of beleeuing for the perfect obedience of the Law. And therefore that in those places, where 'tis said, [*Faith is imputed for Righteousnesse*,] the phrase is to bee expounded *metonymicè*, (that is) Christs righteousnesse beleeued on by faith, is imputed to the beleeuer for righteousnesse.

We are saued by grace thorough faith. Ephes.2.8.

Whereas our aduersaries say that Faith of its owne dignity and deserr, doth not obtaine this fauour of God, to bee esteemed for the perfect righteousnesse of the morall Law: but this comes to passe only by the merits of Christ, who hath procured this grace vnto vs, that God should thus accept of our faith: we answere, that this is affirmed, but 'tis not proued. They speake a little more fauorably then the *Romanists*, who make faith of it selfe to merit iustification.

these

theſe will haue it not to merit it; but to be graciouſly accepted for righteouſneſſe. But wee finde not in Scripture any ſuch doctrine as this, [*Chriſt hath merited that wee ſhould be iuſtified for our faith*,] or [*Chriſt hath merited for our faith, that faith ſhould be eſteemed by God for that perfect iuſtice of the Law; whereby wee are iuſtified in Gods ſight.*] Theſe things the Scriptures teach not: they teach, that Chriſt is our righteouſneſſe, and that wee are iuſtified by his blood and obedience. But that he hath merited by his obedience, that we ſhould bee iuſtified by our owne obedience and righteouſneſſe, is a perverſe aſſertion of men that loue to runne about the buſh, and leauing the ſtraight, to runne in crooked and froward waies. And it differs little from the like ſhift of the Diſciples of *Rome*, who to maintaine merit of our workes and of *Chriſt* too; ſalue it with this trick. *Chriſt hath merited that we might merit.* But we acknowledge, as no other merit, but that of Chriſt; ſo no other righteouſneſſe to iuſtification, but this alone. Thus much of the ſecond aſſertion.

CHAP. III.

The confutation of Popiſh Doctrine, that other graces doe iuſtifie vs, and not faith alone.

THe third and laſt followes, wherein the controverſie is betweene vs and thoſe of *Rome*; whoſe aſſertion is: that

3 A ſinner is not iuſtified by faith alone, but alſo by other *vertues* and *graces*; as *Hope, Loue, Repentance, Feare of God, &c.*

This we alſo reject as an error; contrary to the Scriptures whereby we are taught, that a man is iuſtified by faith alone.

For opening the truth of which point: you must call to mind the different acception of the word *Iustifie*: wherein it is taken by vs, and by our adversaries. With them to *Iustifie* is all one, as to *Sanctifie*: of vniust and vnholy, to make inherently iust and holy. With vs to *Iustifie* is to absolue an offender, quitting him from blame and punishment. According to these different acceptions, this proposition [a man is justified by faith alone] hath a double meaning; one thus [A man by faith alone is inherently sanctified] another thus: [A man by faith alone obtaines absolution in Gods iudgement, from all faultinesse and punishment.] This latter meaning onely is true, and tis that only which is defended by vs of the reformed Churches; Namely, that faith only is the grace of God whereby a sinner beleeuing the promise, and resting himselfe vpon the righteousnesse of Christ, receiues mercy from God in absoluing him from the fault and punishment of all his transgressions: and is accounted righteous for Christs sake. Which gracious priuiledge God hath annexed vnto faith, as vnto the condition of the New couenant, and not vnto Loue, Hope, Feare, Repentance, or any other grace; For not these, but faith onely, respecteth the promise of the Gospell. The former sense of that proposition, is false and absurde, *viz.* [A man by faith alone is inherently sanctified] nor doe any of the reformed Churches maintaine such a construction thereof. Wherefore when *Bellarmine* and his complices dispute eagerly against justification by faith alone, those arguments wherewith they suppose to smite through the truth of our assertion, are let flye at a wrong marke; being all aymed at this Butte, (*viz.*) to proue; that a man is sanctified by other inherent graces as well as faith. Which point we easily yeeld them, confessing that inherent righteousnesse, consists not of

one

one, but of the [a] manifold graces of Gods Spirit, wrought in the heart of such as are regenerate. Neuertheless for the shewing of some points which may be doubted of; Let vs briefly take a view of the chiefe passages of *Bellarmines* long discourse; which hee maintaines from the twelfth chapter of his first booke *de Iustificatione*, to the end. For to proue that a man is iustified not by faith alone. Of his Arguments which are few, I shall name three onely, which are materiall.

[a] πολυποικίλος χάρις. 1. Pet. 4. 10.

1 If other vertues justifie as well as faith, then not faith alone. 1 *Arg. Bell.*

But other vertues doe justifie, Therefore, &c.

The Minor he proues out of the Councell of *Trent Sess. 6. cap. 6.* where seauen preparatory graces to justification, are reckoned vp.

1 *Faith.* 2 *The Feare of God.* 3 *Hope in his mercy.* 4 *Loue of God, as the fountaine of iustice* (*& ad benefactoris*, saith *Bellarmine*) 5 *Repentance, a sorrow and detestation of sinne.* 6 *A desire of receauing the Sacrament of Baptisme.* 7 *A purpose to lead a new life, and keepe Gods Commandements.* All these (saith *Bellarmine*) doe justifie a man, *Præparatorie, antecedenter, dispositiuè.* Faith, thats the root and beginning of our justification, the rest follow in order; all must goe before as needfull preparations: & justification followes as the effect of all in common, &c. *Ergo*, Not of Faith alone. The [b] *Iesuite* goes ouer every particular, to shew by Scriptures what force each of those graces haue to iustifie. But tis not worth while to repeat his proofes. Vnto the Argument, we answere two things.

[b] *Lib. 1. cap. 13.*

1 That it is framed vpon the errour which puts out of frame the whole dispute of our Aduersaries, about this Ar-

ticle of *Iustification*; namely, that Regeneration and Sanctification is all one thing with justification; and that to iustifie a sinner is nothing but to doe away inherent corruption, by infusion of inherent righteousnesse. This wee haue heretofore by the Scriptures cleared to be false; and therefore this argument prouing our sanctification to bee wrought by other graces as well as by faith, toucheth not the point of Iustification in the remission of sinnes, which faith alone obtaineth through the promise.

2 2 Touching these graces which they make preparatory vnto justification, that is to sanctification: We answere, that tis a Philosophicall dreame of such as measure out the workes of Gods spirit in mans conuersion, according to *Aristotles Physicks*; and those disputes touching præuious, or fore-going dispositions, that qualifie the matter for receauing of the forme. We acknowledge, that in mans regeneration all graces of the Spirit are not perfected at once. But as the ioints and sinewes in the body: so the graces of sanctification in the spirituall new birth, are at first weake & feeble: which in continuance of time gather more strength, according to our growth in Christ. But yet these are true for the substance: though imperfect in their degrees and measure There is now true spirituall life in such a one which was before dead in sinne: although there be not the free and able exercise of all the vitall powers. Health there is, but not entire from all degrees of sicknesse, and every kinde of disease. Wherefore we affirme that these vertues, which are by our aduersaries reckoned only as dispositions vnto regeneration, are, if they be true and not counterfeit mettall, the maine parts and fruits of regeneration.

Hence we beleeue that these are foule errors (*viz.*) To teach that a man without grace by the power of his freewill may

may dispose himselfe to his regeneration, by beleeuing in Christ, fearing and louing of God, hoping of his mercy, repenting of his sinnes, resoluing vpon amendment, and all this with true and sincere affection: or to teach if a man cannot doe these things of his owne meere strength and free will; yet by the *Speciall* aide of God inciting and helping him, he may doe them whilst he is vtterly vnsanctified *in statu peccati*. That true faith, and feare, and hope, and loue, & repentance, and purpose of reformation, are vertues & graces in a man that is yet graceless and without vertue, because destitute of sanctification. That these graces consisting in the inward motion of the soule, and change of the affections, are wrought in man, not by any sanctifying grace of the *Holy Ghost*, inwardly touching the heart: but by some other kinde of vertue and aid (they knowe not what) [a] externall, exciting and helping forward the strength of nature. All these are monstrous and mishapen imaginations, bred in proud hearts that would faine share the glory of their conversion, betweene Gods grace and their owne free will, and maintained by curious heads, whom Philosophicall speculations haue transported beyond the simplicity of diuine truth. The Scripture speakes otherwise of these graces, as of those that belong to such as are not in the way to bee made good, but are made so already. [*Yee are all the children of God by faith in Iesus Christ*] saith the Apostle *Paul*, *Gal.*3.28 *Whosoeuer shall confesse that Iesus is the sonne of God: God dwelleth in him and he in God.*] saith *Ioh.*1. *Ioh.* 4.15. and *Chap.*5.1. [*Whosoeuer beleeueth that Iesus is that Christ, is borne of God.*] Doe we by true faith become the children of God, borne of him, in whom hee dwelleth and wee in him, when as yet in the meane time wee are yet vnsanctified, vnholy, vncleane, and not in the state of grace? *Bellarmine* will-

[a] *Lib.*1.*cap.*21. *Nec tamen est à Deo intus inhabitante, per gratiam iustificantem: sed extrinsecus adiuuante & excitante.* *Et Cap.*13. *pag.*311.*H.* *Feare.*

proue that a man may haue faith; yet not bee the child of God: out of *Iohn* 1 12. [*As many as receaued him, to them he gaue power to become the sonnes of God: euen to them that beleeue on his name.*] See (faith hee) they that beleeue are not yet, but haue power if they list, to become the sonnes of God, (*viz.*) by going on further from faith to hope & loue, and the rest of the *Tridentine* dispositions. For tis loue properly and not faith, that makes vs the sonnes of God; as hee would proue (contrary to that expresse place of the *Galat.*) out of the 1 *Ep.* of *Iohn*, where the Apostle hath much excellent matter, but nothing to that purpose. To the place of *Iohn*, we answere, that the *Iesuite* playeth with the ambiguity of the word ἐξουσία, which is not here a liberty to doe what we list; as if we could at our pleasure become Gods adopted sonnes: but tis a right and priuiledge which *Christ* the naturall Son bestowes on true beleeuers, to be made Gods adopted sonnes, and so coheires with him of the heauenly inheritance. When is this priuiledge of adoption bestowed? Then when they beleeue, and assoone as they beleeue, before they be regenerate? No, Saint *Iohn* denies it. [*He giues power to be the sonnes of God, euen to those that beleeue in him.*] Who be they? He answeres, *vers.* 15. [*Which were borne not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*] Faith then is not a preparatiue to *Iustification*, but a part of it.

Feare.

[b] Ps. 111. 10. Prov. 1. 7.

Faith is *Radix*: a part of the tree

And is not Feare of God too? No, saith *Bellarmine*. That is the [b] beginning of wisdome (that is) of perfect iustification. A bad interpretation, but a worse argument. Tis the beginning, therefore not a part. Nay; If the feare of God be the *Alpha* of Christian graces, certainely it selfe makes one letter of that *Alphabet*. Tis such a beginning of wisdome: as it selfe is wisdome too. Else God himselfe deceiues

ceiues vs: who, as it is, *Iob.*28.28 [*Said vnto man: Behold the feare of the Lord that is wisdome, and to depart from evill is vnderstanding.*] And therefore to take it in the *Iesuites* glosse, Feare of God is justification as well as the beginning of it.

Hope.

For hope; If it be true, (*viz.*) [*That* [c] *which makes not ashamed,*] *which is the* [d] *Anchor of the soule, sure and stedfast, that entereth within the vaile.*] It would be knowne what difference the *Iesuite* will put betweene that *Hope* which is in a man before: and that which is in him after his *sanctification.* If he say, it differs only in degree: then he grants, tis the same in substance: whence we haue a faire position; that man sanctified and vnsanctified, is alike capable of the saving Graces of Gods Spirit.

[c] Rom. 5.5.
[d] Heb. 6.18.

Loue.

The like we say for loue of God, if it be sincere and without dissimulation bred in the heart: Vpon those spirituall considerations not only of Gods mercy in Christ: but also of his iustice and infinite righteousnesse; *(For so the Trent Fathers will haue this loue to respect God, vt fontem Iustitiæ)* then we affirme this spirituall loue is not to be found but only in those *Hearts*, that are in some measure regenerate and made spirituall. In [*whom* [e] *this loue of God is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost that is giuen to them.*] as the [a] Apostle speaketh. This *Bellarmine* is soone forced to grant: yet he puts it off with a distinction [*No man can loue God perfectly with all his heart, without the holy Ghost: but loue him he may imperfectly without the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him, though not without the speciall aid of God.*] Whereto wee answere; tis one thing to loue God perfectly, and another to loue him truely. To loue him perfectly, is to loue him with all the heart, all the soule, all the minde, and all the strength: which we grant no man can doe without the *Holy Ghost*: but wee also

[e] Rom. 5.5.
[a] Rom 5.5.

also affirme, that no man did or shall euer doe it in this life, so long as there is lustfull corruption in him causing any the least aversion of his soule from God in any motion thereof. So that if none haue the *Holy Ghost* abiding in them; but such in whom loue is thus perfected; he must be confined with the Saints in heauen, and not haue his dwelling with the faithfull on earth. But if imperfect Loue of God be also from the *Holy Ghost*, dwelling in the hearts of the Godly, who loue God truely in vnfeigned vprightnesse of *heart*; though in much imperfection by reason of sinne, which diverts the heart vnto other pleasures: then it must be knowne of the Iesuite, what he meanes by imperfect loue. Is it false loue such, as a meere natural man may conceaue vpon generall grounds: That God is good, the chiefest good, iust, holy, and full of all excellency? He will not say for shame, this is a true preparatiue vnto *Iustification*. Is it true loue, but in its degree imperfect, not so vigorous, so vehement, so hot as coales of *Iuniper*: yet such as hath some strength & warmth of spirituall affection? Then we require that these men will draw vs out a line by the rule of the Scriptures, and to tell vs how farre the true loue of God may come, without the grace of the *Holy Ghost* sanctifying the heart: But after 'tis past such a degree, then there is required the sanctifying grace of the *Holy Ghost* for it. T'will trouble their Mathematickes to describe vnto vs in what degree of perfection that Womans loue was situated, whose example they alleadge for a proofe of this point out of *Luke* 7.47: [*Her sinnes which were many, are forgiuen her, for she loued much.*] Can *Bellarmine* tell vs how much this was? that so by that patterne we may knowe how farre men goe in the true loue of God before they be at all sanctified by inherent grace? For such wonders they would make vs beleeue concerning this penitent

tent sinner; that when her soule was full of faith and loue to Christ, her heart full of sorrow, her eyes full of teares for her sinnes; yet for all that shee was a graceless, vnholy person; whose *Loue*, and *Faith*, and *Sorrow*, came not from the sanctifying grace of the *Holy Ghost*, but only from free will helped with some kinde of externall aide of God.

Wee haue not Faith to beleeue such mysteries as these. Nor yet in the last place can we conceiue how there should be true repentance with a sincere purpose of reformation & obedience, where the Heart is not changed and renued by the holy Ghost. That godly sorrow and hatred of sinne should spring out of a graceless heart, that so holy a resolution of amendment of life should bee in an vnholy person; be assertions so contradictory and jarring: that no Christian eare can with patience endure to heare them. Wee conclude then touching these dispositions vnto Sanctification, that if these graces be true, they are parts & chiefe branches of inherent righteousnesse. But if they be false and counterfeit, they are not so much as preparations therevnto. So much of this first Argument: wherein yet one of these seuen dispositions first reckoned vp is omitted (*viz.*) a desire of receauing the Sacrament of Baptisme. (that is) A man thats baptised in his youth, afterward, before he be iustified, must haue a desire to be rebaptised. For what is it for one baptised to desire to receaue that Sacrament againe? This conceit is so absurd that howeuer *Bellarmine* reckon it vp among the other Dispositions; because of the authority of the Councell of *Trent*: yet [a] *Becanus* giues it ouer in plaine field; numbring these fore-naming six graces only, chusing rather to venture the Councells credit, then his owne, by defending an vnreasonable position.

Repentance. *Reformation.*

Not of *Abab* or *Iudas*.

[a] *Tom 2 Tract. 4. c.3 Quæst.3 Bell. lib. 1. c. 14.*

2 *Argument.* If Faith alone doe iustifie vs; then it 2. *Arg.*

may doe it when other graces are absent; as well as when they are present. For seeing the vertue of justifying vs depends vpon Faith alone: and that in this act it receiues no aide from any other grace; It followeth that it needs not the company of any other grace: as in the law of sense. If the whole force of burning proceed onely from heat: then where heat is, though there be no other qualities, yet there will bee burning; yea if faith only haue force to justifie, it will follow, that it may iustifie not only in the absence of other graces: but in the presence of the contrary vices. For as the absence of other graces doth not hinder: so the presence of other vices will not hinder faith one iot in its office of justifying.

But twere absurd to affirme, that Faith can justifie without other vertues with other vices, *Ergo*, The force of justifying is not in faith alone.

To this we answere. That this sophisme is fashioned vpon the same blocke with the former, that to justifie and sanctify are all one. In which sense we confesse the consequence is vnavoidable. If faith alone by its owne vertue and force did sanctify: then it would effect this not only in the absence of other graces; but in the presence of their contrary corruptions: and the similitude which wee bring to illustrate our assertion, would confirme that of the aduersaries. Tis the eye only sees, say our men: yet the eare is in the head too. Yea, reply they, But the eye could see well notwithstanding the eare were deafe. Tis the [a] heat only of the fire or Sunne that warmes, though there bee light ioyned with it. True say they, but if there were no light, yet if heat remained, it would warme for all that: as the heat of an Ouen, or of Hell, burnes, though it shine not. Thou holdest in thy hands

[a] *Calv. antid. conc. Trid. Sess. 6. cap. 11.*

hands many seeds (tis the old cõparison of *Luther* on the 15 of *Gen.*) I enquire not what tis together but what is the vertue of each one single. Yea, reply our aduersaries; thats a very needlesse question indeed. For if among them many seeds there be some one that hath such soueraigne vertue; that it alone can cure all diseases, then tis no matter whether thou haue many or few, or none at all of any other sort in thy hand. Thou hast that which by its owne verture without other ingredients will worke the Cure, nor haue we ought to make answere in this case; if, as the eye sees, heat warmes, seeds and other simples doe cure by their owne proper vertue: so faith alone by its owne efficacy did sanctifie vs. But there is the Error. Faith workes not in our sanctification or justification by any such inward power and vertue of its owne, from whence these effects should properly follow. For in sanctification faith, as we haue seene, is part of that inherent righteousnesse which the holy Ghost hath wrought in the regenerate: and tis opposed to the corruption of our nature which stands in Infidelity, Faith sanctifies not as a cause, but as a part of infused grace: and such a part as goes not alone, but accompanied with all other graces, as Loue, Feare, Zeale, Hope, Repentance, &c. Inasmuch as mans regeneration is not the infusion of one; but of the habit of all graces. Againe, 'tis not the Vertue of Faith that iustifies vs; the grace of iustification is from God, hee workes it: but tis our faith applies it and makes it ours. The act of justification is Gods meere worke; but our faith onely brings vs the benefit and assurance of it. Iustification is an externall priuiledge which God bestowes on beleeuers; hauing therein respect only to their faith, which grace onely hath peculiar respect to the righteousnesse of Christ & the promise in him. Whereby tis manifest that this argument is vaine. Faith a-

lone is respected in our Iustification: therefore faith is or may be alone without other graces of *Iustification*. *Bellar.*

[a] Cap.15.eiusdem lib.1.

[b] would vndertake to proue that true faith may bee seuered from charity and other vertues: but wee haue heretofore spoken of that point: and shewed, that [true faith, yet without a forme:] [true faith, dead, and without a soule] be contradictions as vaine as [a true man without reason] [a true fire without heat.] We confesse indeed that the faith of *Iesuites* (the same with that of *Simon Magus*) may very well be without charity and all other sanctifying graces; a bare assent to the truth of Divine Revelations, because of Gods Authority. As tis in Diuels, so tis in Papists and other Heretickes. But wee deny that this is that which deserues the name of true faith: which whosoeuer hath, hee also hath eternall life. As it is, *Ioh.6.47.*

3. *Arg.* 3 *Argument.* That which Scripture doth not affirme, that is false doctrine.

But the Scripture doth not affirme that we are iustified by faith alone *Ergo*, so to teach, is to teach false Doctrine.

Bel.l.3.c.16. This Argument toucheth the quicke: and if the Minor can be proued, we must needs yeeld them the cause. For that the *Iesuites* conceaue that this is a plaine case: for where is there any one place in all the Bible, that faith, *Faith* alone iustifies? They euen laugh at the simplicity of the Hereticks (as they *Christen* vs) that glory they haue found out at last the word *(Onely)* in *Luc.*8.50. in that speech of Christ, to the Ruler of the Synagogue, [*Feare, not, beleeue only, and thee shall be made whole.*]

And much sport they make themselues with *Luther*: that to helpe out this matter at a dead lift, by plaine fraud he foisted into the Text, in the 3. to the *Romans*, the word

(*Only*)

(Onely.) When being caught with the fact, and required a reason: he made answere according to his modesty, *(Sic volo, sic iubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas.)* Tis true that *Luther* in his translation of the Bible into the *Germane* tongue: read the 28. verse of the Chapter, thus *(We conclude that men are iustified without the workes of the Law: onely through faith)* Which word only is not in the originall. Where in so doing, if he fulfill'd not the office of a faithfull Translator: yet hee did the part of a faithfull Paraphrast, keeping the sense exactly in that alteration of words. And if hee be not free from blame: yet of all men the *Iesuites* are most vnfit to reproue him, whose dealing in the corrupting of all sort of writers, Divine and Humane, are long since notorious and infamous throughout *Christendome*.

[Allein durch den glauben]

What *Luthers* modesty was in answering those that found fault with his Translation: we haue not to say. Onely thus much, that the impudent forgeries of this generation, witnesse abundantly: that it is no rare thing for a Lye to drop out of a *Iesuites* or *Friers* penne. But be it, as it may be; Tis not *Luthers Translation*; not that place in the 8. of *Luke*, that our doctrine, [touching iustification by Faith alone] is founded vpon. We haue better proofes then these: as shall appeare vnto you in the confirmation of the Minor of this Syllogisme.

Bell. quotes Lutheri Resp ad duos Art. ad amicum quendā.

Whatsoeuer the Scriptures affirme, that's true doctrine. But the Scriptures affirme, a man is iustified by Faith alone.

Therefore thus to teach, is to teach according to the word of wholesome doctrine.

Our Adversaries demande proofe of the Minor. Wee alleadge all those places wherein the Scriptures witnesse: that we are iustified by faith, without the workes of the Law.

Such places are these, *Rom.*3.28.(*Therefore we conclude that a man is iustified by faith, without the workes of the Law.*) Rom.4.2.3. (*If Abraham were iustified by workes, he hath whereof to glory: but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham beleeued God: and it was counted to him for righteousnesse.*) And vers. 14.15.16. (*For if they which are of the law be heires: faith is made void, & the promise made of none effect. Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression.*) Gal.2.16.(*Knowing that a man is not iustified by the workes of the law, but by the faith of Iesus Christ: Even wee haue beleiued in Christ, that we might be iustified by the faith of Christ, & not by the works of the law, for by the workes of the law shall no flesh be iustified*) Gal.3.21.22(*Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid. For if there had beene a law giuen, which could haue giuen life: verily righteousnes should haue been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all vnder sin: that the promise by the faith of Iesus Christ, might be giuen to the that beleiue*) Eph.2,8.9.(*For by grace yee are saued, through faith, and that not of your selues; it is the gift of God: not of works, least any man should boast.*) Phil.3.8.9.(*Yea doubtlesse, & I count all things but losse for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Iesus my Lord. For whom I haue suffered the losse of all things: & doe count them but dung, that I may win Christ. And be found in him not hauing mine owne righteousnesse, which is of the law: but that which is through the faith of Christ: a the righteousnesse which is of God by faith.*)

Tit.3.5.6.7.

Out of which places, not to name more, expresly touching this point of our iustification, we argue thus.

A man is iustified either by the workes of the Law, or by faith in Christ. But he is not iustified by the workes of the law. *Ergo*, he is iustified only by faith in Christ.

In

In this disiunctiue Syllogisme, they cannot finde fault with vs for adding the word [*onely*] in the conclusion; which was not in the Premisses. For reason will teach them that where two Termes are immediatly opposite, if one be taken away, the other remaines alone. So that in every disiunctiue Syllogisme, whose Major Proposition standeth vpon two Termes immediatly opposite: if one bee remoued in the Minor, the conclusion is plainely equivalent to an exclusiue proposition. As if we argue thus. Either the wicked are saued, or the godly. But the wicked are not saued. Thence it followes in exclusiue termes, therefore the godly onely are saued. Our Aduersaries cannot deny, but that the Proposition [a man is iustified by workes, or by faith] consists of termes immediatly opposite. For else they accuse the Apostle *Paule* of want of Logicke, who, *Rom.*3. should conclude falsely, [A man is iustified by faith without workes] if he be iustified either by both together, or else by neither. Seeing then he opposeth faith and workes as incompatible, and excludes workes from iustification: we conclude infallibly by the Scriptures, that a man is iustified by faith alone. This Argument not avoidable by any sound answere, puts our aduersaries miserably to their shifts. Yet rather then yeeld vnto the truth, they fall vnto their distinctions: whereby, if it were possible, they would shift off the force of this Argument. Whereas therefore the Scriptures oppose *Workes* and *Faith:* the [*Law of Workes*] and the [*Law of Faith.*] Our [*owne righteousnesse which is of the law*] & the [*Righteousnesse of God by faith,*] manifestly telling vs that we are *Iustified*, [*not by Workes, by the law of workes, nor by our owne righteousnesse which is of the law, but that wee are iustified by faith, by the righteousnesse of God by faith.*] Our aduersaries haue a distinction to salue this matter withall.

They

They say then Workes are of two sorts.

1 Some goe before grace and faith, and are performed by the only strength of free-will: out of that knowledge of the Law, whereunto men may attaine by the light of nature, or the bare Revelation of the Scriptures. These workes or this obedience vnto the Law, which a meer naturall man can performe, is (say they) that *Righteousnesse* which the Scripture cals our own. By this kinde of *Righteousnesse* and *Workes*, they grant none is justified.

2 Some follow grace and faith: which are done by Mans freewill, excited and aided by the speciall helpe of Grace. Such obedience and righteousnesse is (say they) called the (*Righteousnesse of God,*) because it is wrought in vs of his gift and grace. And by this righteousnesse a man is justified.

By this invention they turne of with a wet finger, all those Scriptures that we haue alleaged. Wee are iustified [*not by the workes of the Law*] that is, by the obedience of the morall law, which a man may performe without Gods Grace: But we are iustified by (*Faith of Christ*) that is, by that obedience of the morall Law, which a man may performe by faith, and the helpe of Gods grace. [b] Boasting is excluded, saith the Apostle, by what law? By the Law of workes, that is, by the law performed by the strength of nature? Nay, for hee that performes the Law by his owne strength, hath cause to boast of it. By what Law then? By the Law of Faith, that is, by faith which obtaines Gods grace to fulfill the morall Law. Now hee that obeyes the Law by Gods helpe, hath no cause to boast. [c] *Israell which followed the law of righteousnesse, could not attaine vnto the law of righteousnesse.*] Wherefore? Because they sought it not

[b] Rom.3.27.

[c] Rom.9.31. 32.

How knowes *Bellarmine* that? *Bell.lib.* 2.6.19.

not by faith; that is, they sought not to performe the Law by Gods grace; (*But as by the workes of the law,*) that is, by their own strength: Thus *Paul* desires to be found in Christ, (*not hauing his owne righteousnesse which is of the Law*) that is that righteousnes he performed without Gods grace before his *Conversion*; But (*the righteousnesse of God which is by faith.*) i.e. That righteousnesse which hee performed in obeying the Law by Gods grace after his *Conuersion*. For confirmation of this distinction, and the interpretations thereon grounded, *Bellarmine* brings three reasons to shew that when workes and faith are opposed: all workes of the Law are not excluded. *Bell. cap. 16.*

1 Its manifest; Faith is a worke: and that there is a Law of Faith as well as workes. If therefore; *Rom.* 3. all workes, and all Law be excluded from Iustification: then to be iustified by faith, were to bee iustified without faith.

2 Its plaine the Apostle, *Rom.* 3. intends to proue that neither the *Iewes* by the [a] naked obseruation of the Law of *Moses*: nor the *Gentiles* for their good workes before they were [b] conuerted to the faith of *Christ*, could obtaine righteousnesse from God.

[a] *Bell. lib. 1. c. 19.*

[b] *Bec. Tom. 2. tract. 4. cap. 2. quest. 6. §. 15.*

3 The Apostle shewes *Rom.* 4. 4. what workes hee excludes from Iustification, (*viz.*) such whereto wages is due, by debt not by grace. Now workes performed without Gods helpe deserue [c] reward (*ex Debito:*) but workes performed by his helpe, deserue wages (*ex gratia.*)

[c] *Bell. cap. 19.*

I doubt not but (notwithstanding these seeming reasons) the fore-named distinction and expositions of Scripture according thereto, appeare vnto you at the first sight, strange, vncouth, farre besides the intent of the *Holy Ghost*, in all those

fore-reckoned passages of Scripture. Let vs examine it a little more narrowly: and yee shall quickly perceiue; that in this *Schoole distinction*, there is nothing but fraud and shifting. (By workes done, by the strength of nature we are not iustified. By workes done with the helpe of grace wee are iustified.) This is the distinction: resolue it now into these termes which are more proper, and it runns thus. (A man is not sanctified by those workes of the Morall Law which he doth without grace: but a man is sanctified by those workes of the Morall Law hee doth by grace) Both Sentences are squint eyed, and Looke quite awry from the Apostles ayme in this dispute touching Iustification. Is it his intent, *Rom.* 3. to proue that a sinner destitute of grace cannot bee made inherently holy by Morality, or outward workes of Piety? or thus. That a sinner cannot attaine to Sanctification by his owne strength: but hee must attaine to it by the grace of God? Take a suruey of the Chapter, and follow the Apostles Argumentation. All both *Iewes* and *Gentiles* are vnder sinne, *verse 9.* therefore (*euery mouth must be stopped*) and none can pleade innocency; (*and all the world must be guilty before God.*) & so liable to condemnation, *v.*19 What followeth hence now? (*Therefore by the workes of the Law, shall no flesh be iustified in his sight.v.*20.

How strange were this conclusion, taken in our aduersaries construction. *Ergo*, By obedience vnto the Morall Law done without grace no flesh can attaine sanctificatiō, in his sight. For neither doth the Apostle speake of sancticatiō, but of absolution as is apparant; All are sinners against the Law, *Ergo*, by pleading innocency in the keeping of the Law, no man can be wholy sanctified, nor iustified, nor absolued from Blame in Gods sight. Nor yet will the reason immediatly annexed admit the glosse [*workes without Grace*] *By the workes*

workes of the law shall no flesh be iustified in his sight. Why [*For by the law cometh the knowledge of sinne*] that is, *By the Law men are convinced of sinne, and declared not to bee innocent.* Which reason is not worth a Rush, according to our aduersaries construction. Hee that without grace shall doe the workes of the law: hee is not thereby made holy. Why? Because by the law is the knowledge of sinne. The law thus obserued tells him hee is a sinner. In which reason there is no force, vnlesse it bee true on the other side. Hee that by the helpe of grace doth the workes of the law, is thereby sanctified: because the law thus kept tells him hee is not a sinner, which is most vntrue. In as much, as not only those which are destitute of grace; but those that haue grace also, and by the helpe thereof, keepe the Law in some measure, are by the Law notwithstanding convinced to bee sinners. The Apostle yet goes forward. (*If wee be not iustified by the workes of the law, by what then?* Hee answeres, (*verse 21*) *But now is the righteousnesse of God made manifest without the law*) We are iustified by the righteousnesse of God: But what is that? It is (saith the distinction) that obedience to the law which wee performe by Gods grace. A glosse apparantly false. For the righteousnesse of God here is a righteousnesse without the law: But obedience to the law: though performed with grace, is a righteousnesse (*with*) the Law; because tis the righteousnesse of the Law. For 'tis all one, hee that obeyes the Law by his owne strength: if he doe it [d] perfectly hee hath the righteousnesse of the law, and he that obeyeth it perfectly, by Gods grace, hath still the same righteousnesse of the law, and no other. For so the law be kept, it alters not the righteousnesse thereof, that wee keepe it by our owne strength, that we haue of our selues, or anothers helpe that giues vs strength to doe it.

d As *Adam.*

For then that ſtrength which hee giues vs is our owne. Which point duely obſerued cuts in ſunder the ſinewes of this diſtinction; for tis cleare the Apoſtle diſtinguiſheth the Righteouſneſſe of the Law and of God as different in their kindes: theſe make them to be one & the ſame thing, [Obedience to the morall law] but done by diuers helps; one by meere nature: the other by grace. This is moſt contrary to the ſcriptures, and ſpecially to that excellent place *Rom.* 10. 3.4.&c. where the Apoſtle ſhewing the difference betweene the righteouſneſſe which is our owne or of the Law; and that which is the righteouſneſſe of God or faith: tells vs. The righteouſneſſe of the law is thus deſcribed [*The man that doth theſe things ſhall liue thereby:*] but the righteouſneſſe of Faith ſpeaketh on this wiſe [*whoſoeuer beleeueth on him* (i. e. *Chriſt*) *ſhall not bee aſhamed.*] Can any thing bee more plaine; then that the *Apoſtle* oppoſeth here [Doing of the law; & [Beleeuing] in Chriſt: Not [doeing] the law by our owne ſtrength, and doeing of the Law by [Gods grace.] Theſe are *Ieſuiticall* gloſſes that corrupt *Apoſtolicall* Doctrine, and ſtrangely peruert the worke of Chriſt in our redemption, as if hee had done no more for vs but this [h] (*viz.*) procured that whereas wee could not liue by doeing of the law through our owne ſtrength: God will now aide vs by his grace, that wee may fulfill the Law, and by that legall Righteouſneſſe obtaine *Iuſtification* and remiſſion of ſinnes. Wee abhorre ſuch Doctrine, and doe reiect as vaine and imaginary that diſtinction whence ſuch abſurdities neceſſarily follow; [b] more [c] might be ſaid in confutation thereof, were it needfull: but wee haue dwelt long vpon this point, and tis time to haſten forward. By the way vnto the Ieſuites arguments in the defence of this diſtinction wee anſwere.

a *So Bellarmine cap.* 19 anſwering that place, *Gal* 2. (If righteouſnes be by the Law, then Chriſt dyed in vaine) ſaith: Nay, ſeeing we are iuſtified by faith: and workes following it, Chriſt died to purpoſe, that God might giue vs grace ſo to be iuſtified.

Workes without grace doe not iuſtifie. Why? becauſe imperfect, or becauſe done by natures ſtrength. Not the later: For then *Adam* was not iuſtified. Not the former for ſo all good workes of the beſt are imperfect.

1 Wee

1 Wee confesse faith is a worke, and in doeing of it wee obey the Law, because (as Saint *Iohn* speakes) *Iohn.*3. 23. [*This is Gods commandement, that wee beleeue in the name of his sonne Iesus Christ,*] And therefore the Gospell is called [*The law of Faith.*] because the promise of grace in *Christ* is propounded with commandment that men beleeue it. But now wee deny that *Faith* iustifies vs, as 'tis a worke which wee performe in obedience to this law: It iustifieth vs onely as the condition required of vs; and an instrument of embracing *Christs Righteousnesse.* Nor can the contrary be proved.

2 The Iesuites are mistaken in the scope of the Apostle *Rom.*3. whose intent is not to shew the *Iew or gentile* could not attaine sanctification without Gods grace, by such obedience to the Law; as they could performe through the meere strength of naturall abilities. They affirme it strongly; but their proofes are weake, being manifestly confuted by the whole File of the Apostles disputation, who clearely and plainely excludes both Iewes and Gentiles, from being iustified by the workes of the Law without making mention or giueing the least intimation, by what meanes these workes must be performed, whether without grace or by the helpe of grace. Yea it had beene quite besides his purpose so to haue done. For the Apostles argument is cleare as the light; and strong as a threefold cord. All are sinners against the Law, therefore by obedience vnto the Law, (Let men performe which way they list or can, without grace or with grace) no man is in Gods sight pronounced innocent.

3 To the last argument out of *Rom.*4.4. wee answere, 3
The Apostle there proues; that the Faithfull, children of *Abraham*; are not iustified by workes. Because *Abraham*

the Father of the Faithfull was iustified by faith, and not by workes. Where wee affirme; That the Apostle excludeth all the workes of *Abraham* from his Iustification: both such as he performed when he had no grace, and those hee did when he had grace. For those workes are excluded wherein *Abraham* might glory before men. Now *Abraham* might glory before Men as well in those workes which hee did by the helpe of Gods grace: as those which he did without it. Nay more in those: then in these. As in his obedient departure frow his owne Country at Gods command; his patient expectation of the promises; his ready willingnesse euen to offer his owne sonne out of Loue & Duty to God, his religious and iust demeaning of himselfe in all places of his abode. In those things *Abraham* had cause to glory before men, much more, then in such works as hee performed before his conuersion: when he serued other Gods beyond the Flood. Therefore wee conclude that *Abraham* was iustified; neither by such workes; as went before faith and grace in him: nor yet by such as followed after. This is most cleare by the 2. *v.* [*If Abraham were iustified by workes, he had wherein to glory: but not with God.*] Admit here the Popish interpretation: and this speech of the Apostles will be false. Thus [*If Abraham were iustified by workes*] *that is by such workes* as hee performed without Gods gratious helpe [*he hath wherein to glory*] *viz.* before men: but [*not with God.*] Nay, thats quite otherwise. For its euident. If a man be iustified by obeying the law through his owne strength, he may boldly glory before God, as well as before men; seeing in that case he is not beholding to God for his helpe. But according to our doctrine, the meaning of the Apostle is perspicuous. *Abraham* might glory before men in those excellent workes of piety, which hee performed

formed after his *vocation:* and in mens sight he might bee iustified by them. But hee could not glory in them before God: nor yet be iustified by them in his sight. So then all workes whatsoeuer are excluded from *Abrahams iustification*: and nothing left but faith, which is imputed vnto him for righteousnesse; as it is *v.* 3. Whence it followes, That as *Abraham*: so all others are iustified without all merit, by Gods free grace and fauour. For so it follows, *verse* 4. 5. [*Now vnto him that worketh, the wages is not counted by fauour; but by debt: but to him that worketh not; but beleeueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly, his faith is counted for Righteousnesse.*] These words runne cleare, till a Iesuite put his foot into the streame to raise vp the mudde. [*To him that worketh*] that is, which fulfilleth the righteousnesse of the Morrall Law [*the wages*] of iustification and Life [*is not counted by fauour: but by debt*] for by the perfect righteousnesse of the Law; a Man deserues to be iustified and saued. [*But to him that worketh not*] that hath not fulfilled the righteousnesse of the Law in doing all things; that are written therein: [*But beleeueth in him that iustifieth the vngodly*] That is relyeth vpon Christ, who by his righteousnesse obtained absolution for him (that is) Righteousnesse in himselfe. [*His faith is imputed for righteousnesse*] that is. He by his faith obtaines iustification in Gods sight: not by merit of his owne, but Gods gratious acceptation of *Christs righteousnesse* for his.

But here our aduersaries trouble the water by a false interpretation. [*To him that worketh*] that is, say they that fulfills the law by his owne strength. *Wages is not counted by fauour, but by debt,*] but if he fulfill it by Gods grace, his wages is paid him by fauour, not of debt. Wherevnto wee reply: That this glosse is a plaine corruption of the Text.

For

For by workes in this fourth *verse* the Apostle vnderstands that kinde of workes whereof mention is made *verse* 2. By which *Abraham* was not iustified: and these as wee haue shewed were workes done by the helpe of grace not by the meere strength of nature. 2 And againe for the assertion it selfe, namely [*He that fulfills the morrall law by the helpe of Gods graces is iustified, by fauour not by debt*] we say 'tis either a manifest falshood or at best, an ambiguous speech. For tis one thing to bestow grace on a man to fulfill the Law: and tis an other thing to iustifie him; when hee hath fulfilled the Law. If God should giue strength to a man exactly to fulfill the morrall Law that were indeed of his free fauour and grace: but when this man, that hath receiued this strength shall come before God with the perfect righteousnesse of the Law, pleading that in every point hee had done what was required, God is bound in iustice to pronounce him innocent, and of due debt to bestow on him the wages of eternall life. *Adams* case is not vnlike to such a man. For God gaue *Adam* what strength hee had: yet *Adam* fulfilling the Law by that strength, should haue merited Iustification and life. Therefore when the Apostle speaketh of all workes in the perfect fulfilling of the Law, he saith, that [*to him that worketh wages is not counted by fauour: but by debt:*] he speaketh exactly, and the *Iesuits* in excluding workes done by grace comment absurdly. Thus much touching the third point concerning mans iustification by faith alone, as also of the first generall head promised in the beginning. Namely, the condition required of vs vnto iustification (*viz.*) *Faith.*

SECT. 3.

SECT. 3. CHAP. I.

Of the righteousnesse whereby a man is iustified before God: that it is not his owne inherent in himselfe: that in this life no man hath perfection of holinesse inherent in him.

I Proceed vnto the second Generall, of the matter of our *Iustification* where wee are to enquire what righteousnesse it is, for which a sinner is iustified in Gods sight. Iustification and iustice are still coupled together; and some righteousnesse there must be, for which God pronounceth a man righteous: and for the sake whereof he forgiueth vnto him all his sinnes. Nor is a sinner iust before God because iustified: but he is therefore iustified because he is some way or other iust. The righteousnesse for which a man can bee iustified before God is of necessity one of these two. *Sect.3.c.1.* 2 *Generall heads.*

1 Either inherent in his owne person and done by himselfe. 1

2 Or inherent in the person of Christ: but imputed vnto him. 2

A man is iustified either by something in him and performed by him: or by something in another performed for him. The wisdome of Angells and men hath not beene able to shew vnto vs any third meanes. For whereas it is affirmed by some that God might haue reconciled man kinde vnto himselfe by a free and absolute pardon of their sinnes without the intervention of any such righteousnesse, either in themselues or in *Christ*, whereby to procure it: to that wee say that God hath seene it good in this matter rather to follow his owne most wise counsailes; then these mens fooliſh directions. Tis to no purpose now to dispute what God

might haue done, whether God by his absolute omnipotency could not haue freed men from Hell, by some other meanes without taking *satisfaction* for sinne from Christ: whether God ought not to haue the same priuiledge which we giue vnto any mortall king, freely to pardon a Rebell, & receaue him to fauour, without consideration of any goodnesse in him, or satisfaction made by him, or another for him? Or whether sinne doe make such a deepe wound in Gods iustice and honour, that hee cannot with the safegard of either passe by it without amends. Such questions as these are vaine and curious prosecuted by idle and vnthankfull men, who not acknowledging the riches of Gods wisdome and grace in that course of their redemption which God hath followed; would accuse God of indiscretion, for making much adoe about nothing, and teach him to haue gone a more compendious way to worke, then by sending his owne sonne to die for vs. These Criticismes vpon Gods glorious & wonderfull proceeding in mans redemption, we leaue vnto *Socinus* and *Arminius* with their followers, it is our part *sapere ad sobrietatem*, and to vnderstand what God hath; not tell him what he might or should haue done. According to which course of his now reuealed will, we knowe that God hath declared his euerlasting hatred against sinne: as that thing which most directly and immediatly opposeth the holinesse of his nature, and the iustice of his Commandements. Wee knowe that for this hatred which God beareth to sinne, no sinfull creature can be able to stand in his sight, without being consumed vp with the fire of his fierce wrath. And therefore before reconciliation it was needfull, *Satisfaction* should be made: where offence had beene giuen. Which seeing man could not effect by himselfe, God thought it good to prouide a Mediator, who should

b *Lubbertus de Christo seruat. lib.1.cap.1.*

Psal.55. Heb.

should make peace betweene both. So that what ever may be imagined of possibility of other meanes to bring man to life: yet now we knowe that *sic oportuit. Thus Christ* ought to suffer, *Luc.* 24. 26. and that it [*Behoued him to bee like vs, that being a faithfull high Priest, he might make reconciliation for our Sinnes.*] *Heb.* 2. 17. Leauing then this new way to heauen neuer frequented, but by imagination; let vs follow the old waies of *Iustification* that the Scriptures haue discouered vnto vs: which are two and no more. Either by our owne *Righteousnesse* and *Workes*: or by the *Righteousnesse* and *Workes* of another (*viz.*) *Christ*. The former is that way whereby man might haue obtained *Iustification* and life, had he not beene a sinner. But now, man, that is a sinner, cannot be *Iustified* and *saued*: but onely in the latter way (*viz.*) *by the righteousnesse of Christ the Mediator.*

This Diuine truth is of most infallible certainty and soueraigne consolation vnto the conscience of a sinner, as shall appeare in the processe of our discourse, wherein wee shall first remoue [*our owne righteousnesse,*] that so in the second place we may [*establish the righteousnesse of Christ*] as the only matter of our justification in Gods sight.

By our owne *righteousnesse* wee vnderstand as the Apostle doth, *Rom.* 10. [*the righteousnesse of the law or of works*] which is twofold.

1 The fulfilling of the Law whether by the [*Habituall holinesse* of the heart: or by the [*Actuall Iustice*] of good workes proceeding thence. For the law requires both, that the person be *Holy*, endued with all inward qualities of [*Purity and Iustice*] and that the workes be *Holy* being performed for matter and all the *Circumstances according to the Commandement.* 1

2 The satisfying for the *Breach of the Law.* For he that 2

makes full *satisfaction* to the law, which is broken, is afterward no debter to the Law: but to be accounted *Iust* and no *Violater* thereof. Wee must now enquire touching these two: whether a man can be iustified by his owne obedience to the *Morall Law*. Secondly, whether he can be iustified by his owne *Satisfaction* for *Transgression* of the *morall law*. Concerning which two *Queres*: wee lay downe these two Conclusions which are to be made good.

1 1 *No man that is a sinner is iustified by his owne obedience to the morall law.*

2 2 *No man is iustified by his owne satisfaction for his Transgression.*

1 *Conclusiō* For the former. It is the conclusion of the Apostle, *Rom.* 3.20. Therefore by the workes of the Law shall no flesh be *iustified in his sight*] which we proue by these Arguments.

1. *Arg.* The first shall bee that of the Apostle in the forenamed place which stands thus.

Whosoeuer is a transgressor of the morall law: he cannot be iustified by his obedience thereto.

But every man is a transgressor of the morall law. Ergo No man can be iustified by his obedience thereto.

The *Maior* is an vndeniable *Principle* in reason. It being a thing impossible that a party accused as an offender should be absolued and pronounced innocent by pleading Obedience to that *Law* which he hath plainely disobeyed. Wherefore the Apostle takes this *Proposition* for granted in these words of his [*For by the law commeth the knowledge of Sinne*] *v.*20. That which conuinceth vs to bee sinners: by that tis impossible we should be declared to bee righteous. That *Plea* will neuer quit vs; which proues vs guilty. Yea twere not only folly, but madnesse to alleadge that for ones iust excuse which it selfe is his very fault whereof he is accused.

sed. The *Maior* then is certaine.

The *Minor* is no lesse. *(viz.) That every man is a transgressor of the morall law.)* If any sonne of *Adam* will deny this, his owne conscience will giue his tongue the lye: and the Scriptures will double it vpon him. Which hauing concluded [[a] all vnder sinne] averre. That [[b] *If we (an Apostle not excepted) say we haue no sinne we deceiue our selues and the truth is not in vs*] Yea [*If*[c] *we say we haue not sinned, we make God a lier, and his word is not in vs.*] The conclusion then is infallible [*That by the obedience of the Morall law, no man shall be iustified* (that is) *quitted and pronounced innocent before Gods iudgement seat.*] This Apostolicall argument vtterly overthrowes the pride of man in seeking for *Iustification* by the law: and it is of so cleere evidence, that the Adversaries of this doctrine cannot tell how to avoid it. But, forasmuch as many exceptions are taken, and shifts sought out, for the further manifestation of the force hereof against gaine-sayers of the truth: it wil be requisite to examine their evasions. Which wee shall doe in the next argument. Which is this.

[a] Rom.3.9. Gal.3.22.
[b] 1.Ioh.1.8.
[c] Vers.10.

2 *Whosoeuer hauing once broken the Law, can never after perfectly fulfill it: hee cannot bee iustified by his obedience thereto.*

But man hauing once broken Gods Law can neuer after that perfectly fulfill it. Ergo, man cannot be iustified by his obedience of the Law. 2. *Argum.*

The *Maior* of this argument is framed vpon no other ground then the former, and opposed vnto that erronious tenent of our Adversaries. [*That howsoeuer a man be a sinner against the law, yet neuertheless afterward he may be iustified by his obedience of the Law. Because God for the time following gines him grace perfectly to fulfill it.*] Which opi-

nion is directly contrary to the reason of the Apostle which is: *That once a sinner, and alwaies vncapable of Iustification by the Law: for how should the law declare him innocent that hath, though but once transgressed against it.*] He that hath stollen in his youth, and euer after liued truely and iustly, can neuer quit himselfe in iudgement from the guilt and punishment of theeuery by pleading, hee hath kept the law in his latter times. Obedience that followes after, iustifies not from the guilt that went before. As wee shall see more hereafter in the point of mans *satisfaction*. But let vs grant that the law though once broken, yet afterwards fulfilled would iustifie a man: we here defend the *Minor* [*That man hauing broken Gods law, can never afterwards perfectly fulfill it*] and so by that meanes also he is excluded from justification by it. This *Proposition* the *Romanists* will not yeeld to, without strong proofe: Let vs explaine it and confirme it. The *Proposition* may bee set downe in these termes [*No man whosoeuer can perfectly fulfill the morall law in this life*] Man here we consider in a twofold estate, 1 of Nature, 2 of Grace. Touching man in the estate of nature, it is agreed on both sides that the keeping of the law is vtterly and *absolutely impossible* vnto him. But concerning man regenerate and iustified, they of *Rome*, affirme he may keepe the law: we of the reformation granting that *absolutely* it is not *impossible* (for we will not say; but God might if he saw good, bestow such perfection of grace vpon a regenerate man, that afterwards he should liue without all Sinne, and be translated to heauen without death) yet, according to the order which God now holdeth in bringing Man to salvation; wee deny that there ever was or ever will bee any mortall man that hath or shall perfectly fulfill the righteousnesse of the morall law: This shall appeare vnto you, by parting the righteousnesse

nesse of the Law into its branches, whereby you may see what it is to fulfill the law, & how impossible it is so to doe.

The Righteousnesse required by the morall law is of two sorts.

1 *Habituall*, in the inherent holinesse of mans whole person, when such gratious qualities are fixed and planted in every faculty of soule and body: as doe dispose and incline the motions of both onely vnto that which is conformable to the righteousnesse of the law. That such righteousnesse is required by the law, is a plaine case and confessed; that which commands the good, or forbids the euill action, doth command the vertuous and forbid the vitious habit too. He that lookes for purity in the streame, cannot but dislike poison in the fountaine: and God that commands vs to doe good, bids vs also to be holy; nor can wee doe the one, vnlesse we doe the other. And therefore the Apostle ioines both together. [*The end of the Commandement is loue*, (but where?) *out of a pure heart*] 1.Tim.1.5. Pure in heart vndefiled in the way.

2 *Actuall*, In the exercise of all good works enioyned by the Law, and forbearing the contrary evill workes. Whether these good or evill workes bee *inward* in that *spirituall obedience* which the law requires; (*viz.*) in the right ordering of all the motions of our soules, that every one of our *Thoughts*, *Imaginations*, *purposes* of our minde, and all the secret *workings* and *stirrings* of our *affections*, bee altogether imploied vpon *Piety* and *Charity*, not so much as touching vpon any thing that is contrary to the loue of God, or our neighbour. Or, whether these good and euill workes be *outward* in the *bodily obedience* vnto the Law, in doing all and every externall duty of religion towards God: of *Iustice* and *Mercy* towards man; and in leauing vndone the contrary. 2

Further

Further this *actuall* Righteousnesse of the Law is to bee considered two waies:

1 1 As it respects all the Commandements, and so that righteousnesse is onely perfect, which fulfills all and every particular precept of the Law.

2 2 As it respects any one Commandement, or any one duty there in contained. And so we may call that righteousnesse perfect, which exactly performes any one point of the Law, though it faile in others.

So you see what is to be done of him that will perfectly fulfill the law: let vs now see whether any man can doe so, or no. We say no man can doe it; and we make it good in the confirmation of these three Propositions.

1 1 *No man in this life hath perfection of grace and holinesse inherent.*

2 *No man in this life can fully obserue all those good workes both inward and outward which the Law requires.*

3 Cap 3. 3 *No man in this life can performe any one particular good worke so exactly, that in every point it shall answere the rigor of the Law, and Gods seuere iudgment.*

For the first we proue it by this argument.

1 Propos. *Where sinfull corruption remaines in part, there inherent holinesse is not perfect.*

But in every man during this life there remaineth sinfull corruption. Ergo, In no man is there during this life, perfect inherent holinesse.

The *Maior* is without exception. For hee that is in part bad and sinfull, tis not possible, he should be totally good & holy.

The *minor* is most euident by Scripture and each mans experience and reason it selfe. *Gall.* 5.17. The Apostle describes

cribes the combat that is betweene the flesh and the spirit, (that is) betweene corruption and grace, in a man regenerate. [*The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these two are contrary one to the other, so that yee cannot doe the same things that yee would.*] Who can say that holinesse is perfect in that man, in whom corruption of nature, not onely troubleth, but hindreth grace in its holy operation? Shall wee say this contention lasts but for a while after a man is newly regenerate: but in successe of time the spirit gets an absolute victory, corruption being not only ouermastered; but also annihillated? If wee say so, experience will accuse vs, and conscience will iudge vs to be lyars: Where is that man, & who is he named, that can say, he findes no rebellion or distemper in his affections or desires, no disorder in any motion of his soule: but that all within him is sweetly tuned vnto obedience, without iarre and discord arising from corruption? Certainely that humble confession of a most holy Apostle, may cause blushing in any such *proud Iustitiary*. Had *Paul* the body of sinne in him, and hast thou none? He fightes and wrestles [*against the Law in his members, rebelling against the law of his mind,*) yea he is so checkt and mated by it, that [*he can neither doe the good hee would, nor avoide the euill hee would not, when he would doe well, euill is still present with him.*] And so tedious is this toile vnto him; that hee complaines of it at the very heart, and cries out bitterly for helpe in this conflict. Whereupon though hee haue helpe from God through Iesus Christ, yet hath hee not full deliuerance from this inherent corruption, but is faine to conclude in this pittifull manner, [*So then I* [a] *my selfe in my minde serue the law of God: but in my flesh the Law of sinne*) Euen *Paul* serues God in the better halfe of him: doe what he can, sinne

a Αὐτὸς ἐγὼ euen I my selfe. Rom.8.25.

will haue a place in his heart, & a part of his seruice though he be vnwilling to yeeld it. If any will compare and preferre himselfe to this holy man: hee may prooue himselfe prouder, but better then him he cannot. Tis arrogance for a *simple Frier* to claime perfection, when so great an Apostle disavowes it. He that will not acknowledge that corruption in himselfe, which *Paul* (in the name of all) confesseth in his owne person; tis not becaus such a one is more holy then the Apostle: but becaus he is ignorant, and sees it not; or high-minded and scornes to bee knowne of it. Furthermore, reason confirmes what scriptures and experience doe witnesse; (*viz.*) that sinfull corruption will hang fast vpon vs vnto our dying day: for if wee suppose an vtter abolishment of sinne and corruption in our nature; it must needs follow, there will neuer bee any sinfulnesse at all in our workes and liues. Where the habit is perfect, the action is so too: and a sweet fountaine cannot send forth bitter waters. Wherefore seeing not the best of men can liue without manifold actuall sinns: It is apparant, that this ill fruit comes from a bad humor in the tree, and this defect of *actuall obedience*, comes from the imperfection of *habituall holinesse*. This is sufficient for iustification of the truth of our first proposition [*that inherent holinesse in this life, if not perfect;*] Becaus tis alwaies coupled with some sinfull corruption.

But here our aduersaries cry out with open mouth, that wee maintaine monstrous propositions. Namely [b] *That there is no inherent holinesse in a man thats iustified, that after iustification, a man still remaines a sinner and vniust. That in Iustification, sinne is not abolished, but only couered with Christs mantle.* Thence they fall to their *Rhetoricke*, that all *Caluinists* are but painted *Sepulchers faire without*

[b] Becan. Tom. 2. tract. 4. cap. 2. Quest. 1. & 3.

full

full of rottennesse within. Like foolish virgins that haue no oyle of their owne: But thinke to bee supplied by that of other folkes. Like Wolues in a Lambes skinne, which hides, but takes not away their rauening and fierce nature. Like a leprous person in fine cloathes; that lookes to bee fauoured and embraced by his King, because he is well apparelled. For this is (say they) to teach, *That a man iustified is yet a sinner in himselfe. That corruption filthinesse & vncleannesse remaine in him, when yet in Gods sight hee is accounted pure and cleane, because hee hath hid himselfe vnder the cloake of Christs rigteousnesse.* Whence also they tell vs it will follow, *wee make Christs body monstrous, a holy, beautifull head ioyned to filthy leprous members. Christs marriage polluted; A most holy & faire Bridegroome coupled to a foule deformed Spouse.*

To this wee say. Truth is modest; yet shee will not bee outfaced with bigge words. Their eloquence hath slandered; partly vs, partly the truth. Vs, in that they affirme wee deny all *inherent righteousnesse* in a person iustified, which is an impudent calumny. The truth, in condemning that for an error which is sacred *verity* taught vs by God in the Scriptures, (*viz.*) *That a person iustified, is yet after that in himselfe in part sinfull.* This wee still teach & maintaine for a truth, firme as the foundation of the earth, that cannot be shaken, namely, *That although a Iustified person is by the grace of the Holy Ghost dwelling in him made inherently holy: yet this sanctity is not that perfect purity of the heart, which the law requires, because some degrees of impurity and corruption doe dwell in him till death.* And therefore the most iustified person liuing, is yet in himselfe partly sinfull and vniust; but the sinfulnesse is pardoned vnto him in CHRIST.

Against this the *Romish* contend, labouring to proue, that in him that is iustified. *Sinne doth not remaine at all:*

but is vtterly abolished. They proue it by such arguments as these.

1 The Scriptures testifie, *That Christ is the* [c] *lambe of God, that taketh away the sinns of the world.* That *Hee was* [d] *offered to take away the sinns of many.* That in repentance, our *sinnes are* [e] *blotted out.* That God *will subdue our iniquities and* [f] *cast our sinnes into the bottome of the sea*; in allusion to the drowning of the *Ægyptians* in the red Sea. Wherefore if sinne be taken away, blotted our, drowned in the Sea, like the *Ægiptians*: then sure it is abolished, and remaines no longer.

c Iohn. 1. 29.
d Heb 9. 28.
e Acts 3. 19. Εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι, &c.
f Micha. 7. 19.

2 They proue it from the properties which are ascribed to *Sinne*; as namely these.

1 Sinne is compared to spotts, staines and filthinesse: but from thence we are washed by the powring on of (*cleane* [a] *water*) vpon vs; and by the (Blood of Christ.)

a Ezek. 16. 25.
b Apoc 1. 6.
1 Iohn. 1. 7.

2 Sinne is compared to bonds, fetters, and the prison, whereby wee are holden captiue vnder the power of *Satan*: Now *Christ* hath broken these chaines and opened these prison doores, hauing (*deliuered vs*[c] *from the power of darknesse*) and (*redeemed vs from all iniquity*) *and* (*made vs free from sinne to become the seruants of Righteousnesse.*)

c Col. 1. 13.
d Tit 2. 14.
e Rom. 6. 18. 22.

3 Sinne is compared to *sickenesse*, diseases, and wounds. Now God is the best Phisition, the most skilfull Chirurgian: and where he vndertakes the cure, he doth his worke throughly: he cures all diseases and each one perfectly. Hee doth not spread on a sicke man a faire Couerlid, or couer a festered wound with a faire cloath, as *Caluin* imagins: but by a purgatiue potion he expells the disease, by a healing plaister hee cures the

the wound. So that there is not left, nor corrupt matter, nor dangerous sore, that can proue deadly acording to that *Rom.*8.1. (*There is no condemnation to those that are in Christ Iesus*) that is. That is there is no matter at all for which they deserue condemnation, as those expound.

4 Sinne is likned to death, nay it is the *Spirituall death* of the Soule. Now hee that is iustified is restored to *Spirituall Life*, and where life is there death is quite taken away, seeing a man cannot bee aliue and dead both together. Wherefore the Apostle saith *Rom.6.6.* [*Our old man is* f *crucified with him, that the body of sinne might bee* g *destroyed, that hence forth wee might not serue sinne*] and *verse* 11. (*Wee are dead vnto sinne.*)

f συνεσταυρωθη. g καταργηθῆ.

Hence they conclude.

If the filthinesse of sinne bee washed away, the chaines of sinne broken, the diseases and hurts of sinne healed, the Death of sin abolished: then it followes, that sin is quite extinguished, & remaines no more in those that are iustified.

3 They argue thus. If sinne remaine in those that are iustified and be onely couered: then God either knowes of the sinne or knowes it not. To say hee were ignorant of it were *blasphemy* (*all* h *things being naked and bare before his eyes.*) If he know it, then either he hates it or he hates it not. If he doth not hate it how doth the Scriptures say true that he is a (*God that hateth iniquity.*) If hee doth hate it in them certainely he must punish it: God cannot see a fault & hate a fault but he must also punish it too. If he punish it, then he which is iustified shall yet be condemned which is absurd.

3

h Heb.4.13.

Vnto these arguments wee answere. Vnto the two former thus. When wee say *Sinne* remaines in a man regenerate &

Iustified wee must distinguish the ambiguity of the word *Sinne*. In *Sinne*, to vse that distinction which is authenticall with our Aduersaries; There are three things.

1 *The offence of God*, which is the fault.

2 *The obligation vnto eternall punishment*, which is the guilt.

3 *The staine or pollution of the soule, (viz.) the inherent vitious inclination of it vnto euill.* From whence the fault committed first issued, and which by committing of the fault is augmented. For euill once committed leaues a further proneneſſe in the heart to doe it againe. This wee call the *corruption of sinne.*

Thus then we answer. *Sin* doth not remaine in those that are iustified, & regenerate in the two first respects, *viz. of* the *fault and the guilt*, both which are taken away by the death of *Christ*. But *Sin* doth remaine in the regenerate according to the third respect, *(viz.)* the *vitious quality and corruption* thereof, inherent in the soule: Wee shall explaine these answeres, and apply them to the *Arguments*. Wee say then; that the *fault* and *guilt* of *sinne* in the *regenerate*, is vterly abolished by the death of Christ. Which wee doe not take in such a sense as this. That in a man regenerat there is not at all any one fault or guilt to be found, for to say that a man regenerate, when he sins were neither faulty nor guilty, were a grosse vntruth, seeing tis impossible that man should sinne, yet God not be offended; that man should sinne, and yet not be guilty, and deseruing eternall death. Wherefore we confesse that in the holiest of men, if they sinne, ther's a true fault, and God is displeased with it; there is also true guilt, & for it they deserue to goe to hell. But yet this truth also must be acknowledged withall, that all faultinesse and guiltinesse are quite abolished & taken away from them by Christ

Christ, because that both are pardoned vnto them. God is offended; but yet they feele not the woefull effects of his indignation: because in Christ hee is graciously contented to be reconciled with them. Againe they haue deserued euerlasting death: but they come not to the paines thereof, because freed from the punishment by Christs satisfaction. Thus then we vnderstand the first part of the answere. That the fault and guilt of sinne is vtterly abolished, that is, totally pardoned vnto the regenerate, by meanes of Christ, so that no finall eternall punishment shall befall them therefore. The other part. That sinne (*in the vitious quality and corruption if it remaines in men iustified*) wee vnderstand with this necessary [a] limitation, that it remaines in them not in its power and strength: but in its being and life. It hath *vitam*: but not *Regnum*. It raignes where there is no Grace at all: but it liues euen where grace is. Which though it mightily abate the power of it: it cannot vtterly destroy its being. Hence now its easy to vnty the *Arguments*. Sinne is taken away, blotted out, drowned in the bottome of the sea, in regard of those mischieuous effects which sinne would haue brought on vs: God is reconciled, the obligation to punishment cancelled; and all the power, force, and strength of sinne defeated; So that like the dead Egyptians they can no longer pursue the *Israelites* to annoy them, nor shall stand vs as an aduersary in iudgement to condemne vs. The *Guilt* of Sinne is washed away totally by the blood of Christ; the filthinesse of corrupted nature is in part by Degrees clensed by the *Spirit of Christ* powred on vs in his sanctifying grace. The fetters and bonds of sinne, whereby wee were held in bondage vnder condemnation these are quite broken asunder: but those chaines, whereby with *Paul*, *Rom.*7. (*we are led captiue*) to disobedience.

[a] Rom.6.12. 14.

dience are some broken, all weakned. Wee are freed from the power of *Satan* and feare of Hell: but not wholly freed from sinne, whereby we are often captiues against our will. Sinne is a sickneſſe, and God is the Phyſitian; a wound, and God is the Chirurgian, true: but he cures neither perfectly, yet correct that word. He cures our ſickneſſe and ſores perfectly: but not ſuddainely, where he beginns the worke hee will finiſh it: but he will not doe all in a day. The cure begins and goes onward to perfection during this life: but tis neuer finiſhed till after death. *He forgiues* [b] *all our iniquity* and thats done entirely and totally [*and healeth all our infirmities:*] but this is by degrees not all at once. In which courſe God hath no cauſe to feare the cenſure of a Ieſuite for vnskilfulneſſe, nor ſtands hee in need of mans counſaile for preſcription, nor mans helpe to hold his hand in working, if the cure goe on more ſlowly then our fooliſh haſtineſſe thinkes fit. Thats fit and beſt what God thinkes ſo: and if wee count him faithfull and wiſe in his art; tis our duty to take his aduice: but ſaucy preſumption to giue him any. Laſtly, where ſinne is ſaid to bee the (*Spirituall death of the ſoule*) and ſo life being reſtored to iuſtification death muſt needs be quite aboliſhed: the weakneſſe of this argument appeares ſtreight, if the *metaphoricall* terme be changed into *proper*. The death of ſinne is either the Separation of all grace from the ſoule, or the Separation of God fauour from the ſoule. Wee are dead in treſpaſſes and ſinnes both waies: In regard that in the ſtate of vnregeneration the Soule is vtterly deſtitute of all grace and goodneſſe: and alſo becauſe in that condition it is liable to eternall death. Now the death of ſinne that is eternall death in the perpetuall loſſe of Gods fauour this is cleane taken away from him that's regenerate. Chriſt by his death hath purchaſed

[b] Pſal. 13.3.

to

to him life and immortality. But touching that other death (that is) the want of all inherent Grace in the Soule) Wee say. That in regeneration Grace and Holinesse is restored to the Soule, yet not so perfectly as to abolish every degree of sinnefull corruption. Before regeneration the soule had no grace at all and so was vtterly dead but it followes not: that therefore in regeneration, it hath all grace giuen it in all perfection, and so made perfectly aliue: what euer harshnesse there is in the Metaphore, the plaine termes in this case are smooth enough. A man may be at once aliue and dead that is, at once a man may be partly holy, and partly sinfull. [*Our old man is crucified with Christ*] vpon whose crosse it receaued a deadly wound; (because Christ by his sacrifice hath procured the sending of the *Holy Ghost* into the hearts of the elect; who by sanctifying them, abolished their naturall corruptions by degrees. [*That so the body of sinne might be destroyed*,] that is, not presently annihillated: καταργηθῇ made of no force and strength, made vnable to worke strongly in vs. [*That henceforth we might not serue sinne.*] Though alwaies wee should haue sinne in vs. So are wee [*dead to sinne*] not as if sinne were vtterly dead in vs; or had no more working in vs, then it hath in a dead carcase: but because the guilt of sinne is fully taken away, and the power of sinne hath receiued a deadly wound, doth bleed out some of its life now, and shall infalliibly bleed out the last drop of its life hereafter.

Vnto the third Argument, wee answere thus, that the Hornes of those *Dilemma's* be made of wood, and may be easily battered. We say then that God sees and knowes the sinfull corruption which is in the regenerate; for we cannot assent vnto that wilde and franticke imagination of some; who haue troubled the quiet of some places in this land, by

preaching that God doth not, nay cannot see any iniquity or matter of blame, in those that be in Christ Iesus. We beleeue that nothing is hid from his eyes, nor bee our sins lesse visible to him then our graces. God knowes what sinnes his children commit, he iudgeth them to be faults, and such as deserue his infinite wrath. Yea, to goe further, as he sees the sinne of the regenerate: so hee hates it with a perfect hatred; it being impossible, that his pure eyes should behold impurity and loue it. But now what followes hence? If hee see it and hate it, then he cannot but punish it. True, that consequence is certaine. But whats next? If God punish that sin which is in the regenerate, how then is their sinne couered and their iniquities forgiuen? How doth hee account them iust, whom he knoweth and punisheth for vniust? Here's a *Sophisme*. He sees sinne, and hates sinne, and punisheth sin of the regenerate: Therefore hee punisheth it in, and vpon their owne persons. Thats a *non sequitur*. Hee punisheth it, but tis in the person of Christ [*who hath troden the Wine-presse*] of the fierce wrath of God conceiued against all sinfulnesse whatsoeuer in his *Elect*: by which meanes his hatred towards the sinne of the regenerate is fully satisfied, and also his loue towards their persons procured. Hee graciously passeth by their iniquity, pardoning vnto them what hee hates, and hath punished in Christ: in which respect he may be truely said not to see that sinne in them which he will never punish in them, and to couer that sinne which shall never be laid open in iudgement against them.

CHAP. 2.

CHAP. II.

No man can perfectly fulfill the Law in performing all such workes, both inward and outward, as each commandement requires, against which truth Popish Obiections are answered.

AND thus much touching the first Proposition & the first point wherein man fals short of his obedience to the morall law, *(viz.)* in the imperfection *of habituall inherent holinesse.*

We goe on vnto the next Proposition, touching Mans actuall obedience vnto the whole Law. Where wee teach,

That no man can perfectly obey the law in performing all such workes, both inward & outward, as each commandement requires. 2 *Proposit.*

A man would thinke this point needed no other proofe but only experience. In all the Catalogue of the Saints, can you pricke out one that after regeneration, neuer committed sinne against the law? Wee shall kisse the ground hee treads on, if we knowe where that man haunts, who can assure vs that since his conversion hee neuer brake the Law. Shall we finde this perfection in a Monkes Cell, or in a Hermites Lodge, an Anachorites Mue, vnder a Cardinals Hat, or in the Popes Chaire? All these are Cages of vncleannes, not Temples wherein dwels vndefiled sanctity. Neuer to sinne; thats a happinesse of Saints and Angels, with whom we shall hereafter enioy it: but whilst we are mortall we can but wish for it. [*Thy law (*saith *David) is exceeding large.*] It compriseth in it not a few, but many and manifold duties. Good workes are by a kinde of *Popish Solæcisme* brought to Psal. 119. 96.

a ſhort ſumme *Prayer, Faſting*, and *Almes deeds*. Theſe are eminent among the reſt: but not the hundreth part of the whole number. There is beſides a world of duties enioyned, and as many ſinnes forbidden: each Commandement hath its ſeuerall Rankes, euery duty its manifold circumſtances; to reckon vp all, were a buſineſſe which the wit of the ſubtileſt Ieſuite, or the profoundeſt Divine could hardly maſter. To performe them is a taske, which is beyond the ſtrength of the holieſt man, who in finding it a great difficulty to doe any one well, would forthwith iudge the performance of ſo many an impoſſibility. But if this ſuffice not; wee haue expreſſe Scriptures to proue that no man doth actually obey the law in all points. Such places are theſe.

1 (1) 1. *Kings* 8.46. *There is no man that ſinneth not.*

2 (2) *Eccleſ.*7.20. *For there is not a iuſt man vpon earth that doth good and ſinneth not.*

3 (3) *Iames* 3.2. *In many things we offend all.*

4 (4) 1. *Iohn.*1.8. *If we ſay that we haue no ſinne, wee deceiue our ſelues, and the truth is not in vs.*

Whence we conclude, that [*de facto*] neuer any did keepe the law: but brake it in ſome, yea, in many things. And therefore we ſay that the diſpute of our Aduerſaries, touching the poſſibility of keeping the law, vaniſhes to nothing. For ſeeing no man hath, or will ever actually keepe it (as the Scriptures witneſſe) to what end ſerues all the quarrelling and diſpute about the *poſſibility* of *keeping* it. Noe man ſhal be iuſtified by the law, becauſe he hath a power to keepe it if he liſt: but becauſe hee hath actually kept it. Whence it is manifeſt that the reply of our aduerſaries is ridiculous. No man indeed doth keepe it: but yet they may if they will. For 1. What is that to iuſtification? Can a man thats regenerate be iuſtified by his obedience of the law, when yet after his regeneration

generation he doth not keepe it? 2. And againe, How know these men that there was, or is, such a power in the Saints to keepe the law, when yet the world neuer saw it brought into Act? Is it not more probable that what neuer was, nor will be done, neuer could nor can be done? Were they all idle, and did not doe their best indeauour? Tis true, none doth so much good as hee should and might: but yet tis a sharpe censure to say that none would put themselues forward to the vtmost of their might. What shall be said of St *Paul* (*Phil.*3.12.) Hee confesseth that himselfe was not yet perfect: but that he sought after it. How? negligently? No, with great diligence and intention. He followed after. [διώκω] *v.*12. and that eagerly, *Reaching forth to catch the things that were before* τοῖς δ' ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος *v.*13. *And pressing towards the marke*, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω, *v.*14. Here was diligence, & we cannot say that St *Paul* did not doe his best. Did *Paul* then fulfill the Law? It seemes so, for here we see he was willing, and in another place *Bellarmine* tells vs hee was able, for so wee haue it, *Phil.* 4. 13. *I can doe all things through Christ that strengthneth me:* that is, fulfill the moral law by the grace of Christ. Now if he were willing and able then certainely he kept it. Nay tis certaine he did not keep it. Witnesse the testimony of himselfe. *I doe not the good things which I would: but the euill which I would not, that doe I, Rom.*7.19. Where is the fault then? In the Apostles will? No, tis plaine he would haue done it. Wast then in his ability? Yea, this was it. To will was present with him: but hee found no meanes to performe that which is good, *verse* 18. *Lib.4.cap.20.*

The *Iesuite* then abuseth vs with a false exposition of that place to the *Philippians* interpreting it of the Apostles ability to performe the morall law, which himselfe meant con-

cerning that strength wherewith Christ enabled him vnto contentation and patience in all conditions whatsoeuer. *Paul* was able to beare all afflictions patiently, to vse prosperity soberly: but to fulfill the Law in all things perfectly hee was not able. And if he were not, who is? Wee conclude that the actuall obedience of the morall law in fulfilling all the commandements exactly, is impossible to a regenerate man in this life. Let vs now take a short survey of our aduersaries Arguments whereby they would proue that actuall obedience to the whole law is not only possible: but also very easie to the regenerate and iustified. They are those.

Bel.l.4 de Iust. cap.1.10. 11. 12.13. Becan. tom.2. tract.4 cap.4. quæst.1. [c] βαρεῖαι.

1 *That burden which is light may bee carried without shrinking vnder it, that yoake which is easie, is worne without paine; those Commandements which are not burdensome, may be obserued without difficulty. But such is the morall law.* [*My yoake is easie and my burden light*] *Mat.*11.30. [*This is the loue of God that ye keepe his Commandements, and his Commandements are not* [c] *grieuous.*] 1.*Ioh.*5.3. *Ergo, The Morall Law may be easily obserued.*

To this we answere, that the place of *Matthew* is to bee vnderstood not of the morall law: but of the yoake and burden of the crosse and afflictions which euery one must beare, that will follow Christ and obey the Gospell. To those that are wearied and laden with the crosse, Christ speakes by way of consolation, telling them whether to resort for help. (*Come to me and I will giue you rest*) that is comfort and deliuerance. 2 Then hee perswades them to patience vnder their affliction. [*Take vp my yoake vpon you*] and beare it chearefully, which his perswasion he strengthens with three
1 arguments. 1 From his owne example. [*Learne of mee*] to doe and suffer as I doe, enduring so many persecutions and afflictions

afflictions with all meeknesse and patience. *For I am meeke and lowly in heart*, quietly bearing all wrongs and indignities from man without murmuring against God, repining against man, seeking revenge at their hands that haue vniustly persecuted me. 2 From the successe of this patient enduring according to *Christs* example. *And yee shall finde rest vnto your soules*; comfort in affliction, seasonable deliuerance from affliction. 3 From the nature of such crosses. *For my yoake is easie, &c.* Though they be yoakes and burdens which for the present seeme grieuous: yet they bee easie, they be light, because Christs yoake and Christs burden, which he laies on all his true Disciples that follow him, and which he will giue them strength to support and beare out with cheerefulnesse. This seemes the most naturall interpretation of this place, and it is most agreeable to the twelfth Chapter to the *Hebrewes*. Where the like arguments are vsed to comfort the godly in such afflictions, as follow the profession of the Gospell. But yet if wee vnderstand it of the yoake and burden of the Law: Wee answere to it, and that place in *Iohn*, that the Commandements of God are not grieuous to the Regenerate; not because they can perfectly and easily fulfill them: but because that which made them intollerable and vnsupportable vnto them, is now taken away. Whats that? The rigor of the law in requiring of every man exact obedience, vnder paine of the curse of eternall death. Here was the vneasinesse of the yoake which pinched man in his sinfull state; this was the waight of the burden, vnder which every man out of Christ must needs bee crushed and sinke downe to hell. Now Christ hauing fulfilled the Law, and satisfied for all our transgressions thereof, hath made this yoake easie for the necks, and this burden light vpon the shoulders of the regenerate; because though they bee tyed

to

to obey; yet not vpon those seuere termes of being eternally accursed, if they at any time disobey. Now they are assured their hearty obedience shall be accepted, so farre as they are able to performe it; and where they faile they shall bee mercifully pardoned. Which is a singular encouragement of a Christian heart, to shew all willing and cheerefull endevour in obeying Gods Commandements, whereby he may giue good proofe of his vnfained loue vnto God himselfe.

2 Againe we answere that this vneasinesse & burdensomenesse of the *Morall Law*, is to bee taken in regard of the enmity and opposition which a carnall man beares vnto the obedience thereof. Vnto a naturall man it is the greatest toyle and wearisomnesse in the world, for him to bee made to drawe in this yoake. For him to bridle his desires; to checke his disordered affections; to restraine himselfe of his pleasures; to be tied to the exercise of *Religion*, to haue a lawlesse minde brought in subiection to a strict Law: Oh what a wearinesse is it, how he snuffes at it? Hee chafes and sweats vnder such a burden, more then vnder the waight of ten talents of led. But now vnto a heart sanctified by grace, all such obedience becomes sweet, pleasant, and delightfull. The heart now loues the holinesse of the Law; it [b] *delighteth in the Law*; takes contentment in [c] *the obedience of it*, and is full of singular affection and desire after it. Whence though it faile in many things through manifold infirmities and temptations: yet it ceaseth not in a willing, constant, & cheerefull endeauour to performe all. Grace fighteth with many difficulties, and in the combate takes many a foyle: but yet at last the victory falls on her side. For (saith Saint *Iohn*) [d] *He that is borne of God overcommeth the world.* So that *the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life*; which he vnderstands by the world, (1. *Iohn* 4.16.) prevaile not

Mal.3.13.

συνήδομαι &c.

[b] Rom. 7. 21.

[c] Ps.119. *per totum.*

1. Ioh.5.4.

not against him, to turne him away from the holy commandement giuen vnto him. But he still obeyes cheerefully and syncerely; though not euery way perfectly. This of the first Argument. The second is this.

2 *If the hardest precepts of the Law may bee kept; then much more all the rest which are easier.* 2. *Arg.*
But the hardest precepts may be obserued,---- Ergo, the rest also.

They proue the *minor* thus.

Three precepts there are, which are most hard as all confesse.

1 *Thou shalt loue the Lord with all thy heart.*

2 *Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy selfe.*

3 *Thou shalt not couet.*----- The tenth Commandement.

But now all these three commandements may bee kept by the regenerate. Ergo the rest; and so the whole law.

We deny the *minor* of the *Prosyllogisme*, and say that those three precepts are not to be kept perfectly by any man in this life. They proue it in each particular.

1 *That a man in this life may loue God with all his heart.* This they proue.

1 *By Scripture. Deut.* 30.6. *The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to loue the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soule, that thou maiest liue. This is a prediction or promise of that which was heretofore, and is still accomplished in the regenerate, who being sanctified and purified from sinne (a worke of Gods spirit in the heart figured by externall circumcision of the flesh) should loue God with all their hearts.*

2 *By example of Dauid, who saith of himselfe, Psal.* 119. 10. *With my whole heart haue I sought thee; and God also te-*

 stifies

stifies of him: That he kept his commandements, and followed him with all his heart, to doe that only which was righteous in his eyes, 1 *Kings* 14.8. *The like is recorded of Iosiah,* 2 *Kings* 23.25. *And like vnto him was there no King before him that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soule, & with all his might according to all the Law of Moses: neither after him arose any like him. These men then loued God with all their hearts.*

3 *By reason; For to loue God with all the heart, carries one of these three sences. First, to loue him only, and nothing else, and so wee are not commanded to loue God with all our heart, because we must loue our neighbour too.* 2 *To loue him* tanto conatu, qnanto fieri potest; (that is) *as much as may be. Nor is this commanded* (saith *Becanus*) *and yet if it were, who would say twere impossible to loue God as much as one can.* 3 *To loue God aboue all* (*that is to preferre him before all creatures, before father and mother, as Christ bids Mat.* 10.37. *and as Abraham did before his onely sonne. Now this only is to loue God with all the heart, and thus, men may doe as appearet hin the Martyrs and others, who left all for Gods loue.*

Vnto these Arguments wee answere. That it is not so easy a matter to loue God, with all the heart, as these imagine.
a Lib. 4. c. 11. a *Bellarmine* indeed makes a (but) at it. There is nothing required (saith hee) of vs: But to loue God with all the Heart. As if it were as easily done, as spoken. But wee beleeue that in this (*But*) God hath set vp a white, which all the men in the world, may and must aime at: but none will shoote so steadily as to hit it. Vnto the place of *Deuteronomy*, we say. God therein tells vs what his gratious worke is in *circumcising*, or *sanctifying* our hearts, & what our bounden duty is thereupon (*viz.*) to loue him with all our hearts:

the

the performance whereof wee must endeauour sincerely, though we cannot doe it perfectly. For the examples of *Dauid* and *Iosiah*, who are said to follow the Lord with all their heart; there is nothing else meant thereby: but a sincere intent and endeauour in the generall to establish and maintaine Gods pure *Religion* in their kingdome free from corruption of *Idolatry*; as also for their owne particular conuersation to liue vnblameably. For *David*, tis a cleare case that not perfection; but syncerity is his commendations; whose many sinns recorded in the scriptures witnesse sufficiently that he had in his heart that corruption which many times turned the loue thereof from God to other things. How did hee loue god with all his heart when hee defiled *Vriahs* bed, shed *Vriahs* blood, intended to murder *Nabal*, iudg'd away an honest mans lands to a fawning *Sycophant*, with such other faults. The *Prophet* himselfe in that place 119. *Psal.* witnesseth; as the vprightnesse of his heart [*with my whole heart haue I sought thee:*] so withall the weaknesse and corruption of it: against which he humbly craues Gods assistance in the very next words, [*Let me not wander from thy commandements.*] For *Iosiah*: tis plaine that this singular commendation is giuen him, because of his through reformations of the most corrupt estate of religion, which was before his reigne. Wherein many Godly Kings before him had done some thing in redressing some abuses: but none went so farre in a zealous reformation of all, according to *Moses* Law. Wherefore the text saith, that there was no King before him like vnto him, which cannot bee meant absolutely of all, (for *Dauid* is said to follow Gods will with all his heart; as well as *Iosiah*:) but since the time that religion began to be corrupted in the *Iewish Church*, there was none of all the Kings of *Iudah*, that was so faithfull as *Iosi-*

ah, to restore all things to the first purity. Whence he hath the praise, that he turned vnto God more entirely, then any other King before or after him. But now from *Iosiahs* zeale in reformation to conclude, that in euery particular of his life he kept the Law perfectly, louing God with all his heart; is a consequence, that wants strength of connexion.

Vnto the reason from the meaning of the Law, we grant. That the first is not the meaning of it. But for the second, *(viz) That to loue God with all the heart, is to loue him as much as may be.* The *Iesuite* hath no reason either to deny, that this is not commanded; or to affirme that if it were commanded, tis yet possible to doe it. Would any man say; except hee care not what hee say, that God doth not command vs to loue him as much as may bee? Or will it bee a truth from any mans tongue, to say, that he loues God with as great perfection as may bee? It cannot. Which appeares thus. Gods will is, that wee should loue him with all our hearts. Now Christ hath taught vs to pray. *Thy will be done earth as it is in Heauen.* Thence tis euident, wee on Earth are bound to fulfill the commandement of louing God: as the saints in heauen doe fulfill it. But now our Aduersaries themselues grant, that whilest we bee [*in viâ*] wee cannot loue God so much as wee shall doe [*in patriâ*] whence it followes, that no man can loue him so much as may be, and as he ought to doe: seeing no man hath his heart repleniſhed with that measure of diuine loue, whereof his nature is capable, which either *Adam* had in his innocency; or the Saints haue in glory.

Touching the third sense of the words, wee grant indeed; that to *loue God with all the heart*, is to *loue him super omnia*, that is aboue all creatures. But the *Iesuites* take here but one part of true loue of God. Tis a singular part of di-

uine

uine loue, when the heart is so fixed on God: that neither the loue nor feare of any earthly thing can draw it from obeying of God. Which wee say, is a matter wherein euery one failes in some kinde or other, more or lesse, though in the end many Martyrs and other holy men, haue herein by faith ouercome the world. But this is not enough vnto perfect loue, to preferre God before all temporall paines and pleasures, profits or discommodities. He loues God with all his heart, not only who loues him aboue all, but also obeies God in all. *This is the loue of God that wee keepe his commandements.* Hee that for Gods loue will not obey Gods Law: hee loues his sinns more then God. Offend but in the least thing, ther's presently want of loue: for he that will not doe as God bids him then, is voide of that loue which moues him to obey at other times. *Hee then that keepeth Gods word, in him is the loue of God perfect indeed.*-- ἀληθῶς τετελείωται, 1 *Iohn* 2. 5. Perfect obedience and perfect loue are inseparable. Now seeing the former cannot be found in mortall men: wee cannot in them seeke for the latter. And therefore this commandement [Loue God aboue all things] cannot be kept in this life.

2 *That a man may loue his neighbour as himselfe. For which purpose they turne vs vnto* Rom. 13. 8. *Hee that loueth another hath fulfilled the law. Because the law is comprehended in this saying, Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy selfe,* v. 9. *& loue doth not euill to his neighbour: therefore is loue the fulfilling of the law,* v. 10. *And they bid vs looke* Gal. 5. 14. Where wee read, *For all the Law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy selfe.*

Hereto we answere. That ther's in these places, nothing that needs answering. Wee grant, that the loue of our

neighbour as of our selues, is the fulfilling of the Law; that is, of the second table of the law, touching our duty vnto man, & so much these places witnesse, commanding vs also so to doe. But now how doe our aduersaries proue out of these places that men can perfectly obserue this Law. Wee yeeld the regenerate loue their neighbours as themselues: but that *perfection* of *loue*, which in euery point fulfills the Law, doeing our neighbour no hurt, but all good, in all our thoughts, words and deeds; this wee cannot grant them, vnlesse vpon better proofes. Let vs goe to the tenth Commandement, which they say may be kept, that is.

3 *Thou shalt not couet. This tenth commandement of the Decalogue, is (say they) possible to be fulfilled by a Regenerate man. For three things must be obserued, touching this concupiscence, or coueting forbidden in the tenth commandement.*

1 *The vitious proneneſſe and inclination of nature vnto bad desires, which is styled concupiscence in* actu primo. *As to haue a theeuish minde.*

2 *The inordinat motions of the heart immediatly arising from that corrupt disposition, which preuent reason, and goe before consent; as to desire another mans money: but sodenly vanisheth of it selfe, or vpon deliberation tis checkt.*

3 *The consent of the will, when either it takes immediate delight in such desires themselues; as speculatiue fornication, &c. or when it resolues to put in execution what the heart imagined; as to lay a plot to spoile another of his goods.*

The two former, the vitious disposition of nature, and the inordinate desire that goe before consent these bee no sins, (say the Romanists) *and so not forbidden in the ten commandements. The last (viz.) Euill desires with*

with consent, they be the very sinns which are forbidden in that commandement: Whence they conclude that a regenerate man may avoide the breach of this commandement seeing it is in the power of his will, whether he will consent vnto such motions of the heart or no: & if he doe not consent, then he sinns not.

Herevnto we answere. That whereas they of *Rome* teach, that the *Habituall vitiousnesse* of nature and the *disorderly motions* of the heart which goe before consent, are no sins: they therein erre grossely against Scriptures and sound *reason*. Tis the gift of these men alwaies to iudge flatteringly and fauourably on natures side: they conceipt to themselues a God in Heauen like their God in *Rome*, *Facilem Deum*, one that will winke at small faults, and graunt *Indulgences* by the dozen. Looke what they iudge a small matter God must be of their minde: or else they are not pleased. His loue must fit their humors; what they thinke they can doe; that God shall haue leaue to command or forbid: but if otherwise they'le tell him to his face, that hee is a foole or a Tyrant, to command them that, which now they cannot performe. For God (say they) to require of man a freedome from all *vitious inclinations* and euill desires, this were as mad an iiunction, as for a master to command his seruant neuer to be hungry, or thirsty, hot or cold, and to threaten him, that he should looke through a halter, in case it bee otherwise with him. This error we shall more conueniently speake of in the refutation of common and generall exceptions, which they make against all those proofes, that doe demonstrate the impossibility of keeping the law, whereof this is one, that concupiscence in the first and second act is not sinne. But now whereas they affirme that it is in a regenerate mans power not to yeeld consent to the motion of

sinne

sinne, and that therefore he may fulfill the law which sayed (thou shalt not lust) we graunt them that the spirit may many times get the victory, ouermastring such vnruly motions of the heart: but this is not perpetuall. For who is there (except extreamely ignorant of grace and nature) but will confesse that many times these παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, *affections of sinne* as the Apostle calls them, doe worke in them so strongly, vpon such circumstances and aduantages, that they doe non only [ἀντιστρατεύεσθαι, *combate and fight*] against the powers of grace, but also [αἰχμαλωτίζειν *vanquish them*] and euen lead a man regenerate captiue vnto the law or command of sinne. The Apostle confesseth so much of himselfe *Rom.* 7. 23. Who yet was able to doe as much as he that thinkes himselfe best. And therefore what euer power we may seeme to haue not to yeeld consent: yet 'tis certaine that wee shall often faile in our practise.

This of the second argument touching the obseruation of the hardest precepts of the Law: The third followes.

3. Arg. 3 *If a man may doe more then the law requires, hee may certainely doe as much.*

But a man may doe more then the law requires. Ergo he may doe as much.

The minor Bellarmine proues by the example of the young man Mat. 19. who telling Christ that hee had obserued all the commandements and that from his youth; our Sauiour bids him doe one thing more and then hee should be perfect. [*If thou wilt be perfect, goe sell that thou hast and giue to the poore and follow mee.*] *ver.* 20. *Now if the young man had done this, he had done more then the law required. In as much as whatsoeuer the law required he had obserued formerly. For doe you not beleeue him that hee spake true?* [*all these things haue I obserued from my youth*] *verse.* 9. where-

Whereto we answere. That we doe not beleeue the testimony of that vaine young man touching his owne *righteousnesse*. Who boasted of keeping the second Table in the outward duties thereof: when as yet he wanted inward charity towards his neighbour and loue towards God. Hee avouched that he had kept all perfectly fulfilling that Commandement [*Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy selfe*:] & therevpon is so bolde as to aske *Christ*. *What lacke I yet?* Christ to convince him of his pride and wants, puts him to the triall. If thou hast such perfect charity towards man; then certainely if God command thee to bestow, not a part, but all thy goods vpon the poore, vpon promise of better things to thy selfe: thy duty vnto God and singular charity to men, will make thee doe so. [*Goe then sell all that thou hast and giue* [a] *to the poore.*] Vpon this speciall Commandement, this couetous minde shewes it selfe. Nay, 'tis plaine he loued not his neighbour, so well as his riches. Hee is neither so dutifull to God; nor charitable to the poore: as for either of their sakes, to part with his possessions. But, might he say, what? will not ordinary almes, or a little more then ordinary serue the turne? Must I giue away all. Indeed the Law requires that I be mercifull to the poore: but wheres any law that bids me sell my whole estate and distribute to them that want? Christ laies an vnnecessary burden vpon me; if I cannot be perfect without vndoing my selfe, I will content my selfe as I am, and not seeke after such perfection. Here a Papist will say he spake reason, seeing Christs speech was but a counsaile of more perfection, then the Law required. Now a man is not to be blamed if he chuse only to bee as perfect as the Law commands him, and so this young man was: if you'le beleeue him or them. But the Scripture makes it plaine that he did evill in disobeying Christ; and,

[a] δὸς τοῖς πτωχοῖς. i.e. *da partem non omnia. Quę expositio probabilis est, non infallibilis.*

that if he had obeyed him in that particular, he had done no more then the law required at his hands. For obedience to every ſpeciall Commandement is included in the generall. The Law indefinitely commands vs to giue almes: now if God by a ſpeciall commandment limit how much we ſhall giue; whether halfe or all our eſtates, to obey ſuch a particular precept is not to doe more then the general law requires vs. Such a particular commandment was this of Chriſt vnto the young man, wherein hee ſets him a ſpell, according to that conceit of perfection which he had of himſelfe: putting him to the practiſe of the higheſt duty which the law of liberality can poſſible require of a man *(viz.)* to part with all. This hee ought to haue done vpon Chriſts particular commandement; in not doing of it he brake the law, and proclaimed his heart to be full of couetouſneſſe, devoid of faith in God; and true charity towards his neighbour. From this place then our adverſaries cannot proue, that this young man might haue done more then the Law required: or that we are bound at any time to doe as Chriſt bid him. Chriſts command was for his particular triall: not for our imitation. They that take it otherwiſe be a generation of men that profeſſe beggery; and poſſeſſe kingdomes, who were willing enough to part with that little they had of their owne, that ſo they may liue the more *largely* and *plentifully* vpon other mens. We goe forward to the next argument.

4 Arg. 4 *If the Law were impoſſible to be kept it were no Law: for there is no law of things impoſſible. Yea God were more cruell and fooliſh then any Tyrant, to command vs to doe that which is impoſſible for vs to doe.*

To this we anſwere, that the conſequences were true if God had giuen a law which men neuer had ſtrength to performe. But now the law written in tables on Mount *Sina*, was

was but a reuiuing and repetition of the ſame law, which was written in *Adams* heart; the characters whereof were now defaced in his ſinfull poſterity. *Adam* had ſtrength ſufficient to fulfill it: which as he receaued for himſelfe & vs; ſo he loſt it for both. Neuertheleſſe though ſtrength to obey be loſt: yet the obligation to obedience remaines. Wee are no more diſcharged of our duties, becauſe wee haue no ſtrength to doe it: then a debter is quitted of his bands becauſe he wants mony to make payment. Nor is this cruelty or folly in God, that when he publiſhed this law vnto the *Iſraelites*, he did not qualifie the exactneſſe thereof, fitting the precepts to their abilities, commanding them to doe iuſt as much as they could or would doe. Had God made a Law in that ſort in fauour of mans ſinfull nature: they might with better reaſon haue laid folly to his charge, for bending the rule to the crookedneſſe of mans heart; and not leuelling it according to the ſtreightneſſe of the rule. God was to ſet forth a law of liberty, that ſhould not flatter but freely rebuke man of all vnrighteouſneſſe;[a] a perfect law containing in it a full deſcription of *Holineſſe* and *Iuſtice*, which man ought to haue and performe towards God and his neighbour: and in this caſe God had iuſt reaſon to haue reſpect vnto mans duty; not his ability, which once he had; but now had forfeited and loſt.

[a] Iam.1.25. Pſ.19.7.

The next argument is.

5 *Every prayer made in Faith according to Gods will is heard and granted. But we pray that we may fulfill the Law perfectly. (For wee pray that wee may doe Gods will in earth, as it is in Heauen.)*
Ergo God heares vs, and giues vs ſuch grace that wee can doe it.

5 *Argum*

Hereto we anſwere. That this prayer ſhewes vs what we

are bound to; & what is our duty continually to endeuour. That wee may doe Gods will every day more perfectly, cheerefully and constantly, then other. And so farre God heares the faithfull prayers of his louing children, enabling them to better performance, the longer they liue. But that such perfection of obedience is giuen to vs in this life; as the Saints enioy in heauen, will not be granted by our aduersaries themselues. Wherefore they must also grant that that prayer is heard and granted vs by degrees. In this life wee attaine such perfection as Gods sees fit for vs: afterwards, that which is compleat.

6 Argum. 6. *They proue by these Scriptures, that the Law may bee fulfilled. Gal. 5. The Apostle reckons vp the fruits of the spirit. Loue, ioy, peace, &c. then he saith vers. 23. that against such there is no law.* [*That is (saith Bellarm.) the law cannot accuse such men of sinne. So 1. Iohn. 3. 9.* [*Whosoeuer is borne of God, doth not commit sinne, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sinne because he is borne of God.*] *Ergo the regenerate cannot so much as breake the law.*

We answere. That both these places are peruerted by false interpretations. Against [a] such there is no law saith the Apostle. Against what? Such persons, or such graces? If it be meant of persons, (*viz.*) that such as haue the spirit, and bring forth the fruits of the spirit there mentioned against those there is no law: we must take it in the Apostles owne meaning, which he expresseth. *vers.* 18. [*If yee be led by the spirit yee are not vnder law*] How is that? Are not the *Regenerate* vnder the law, that is vnder the obedience of the Law. Yes, we grant on both sides that grace frees vs not from subiection and obedience vnto Gods law. How then are they not vnder the law. Tis plaine. They are not vnder the

[a] κατὰ τούτων

the curse and condemnation of the law, as those bee that walke in the flesh and doe the workes thereof, who therefore [shall not *inherit the kingdome of God, v.19.*] and thats to be accursed. But such as walke in the spirit being regenerate and iustified, are not vnder the curse: and therefore though the law may and doth accuse them of sinne: yet the law is not so against them, as to bring condemnation vpon them (as it doth vpon other) from which in Christ they are freed. If the clause be vnderstood of the *Graces* of the Spirit, there reckoned vp, the sense is this. Against such workes there is no law forbidding them, as there is against workes of the flesh: these agreeable, those contrary to the law. But this makes nothing to our aduersaries purpose. For the place in *Iohn* [*Hee that is borne of God doth not commit sinne yea cannot*] If our aduersaries exposition according to the very letter may stand good it will follow. That in the *regenerate* there is not only a possibility to keepe the law: but also an impossibility at any time to break it. But they easily see how absurd this position is, & that it being granted their doctrine of falling away from Grace lies flat in the dust: seeing *Iohn* saith expresly. *That a man regenerate* (not only) *doth not*, but *cannot sinne.* Therefore certainely he cannot fall from grace. Wherefore they helpe it out with a distinction. Hee cannot sinne, that is, *mortally.* He may sinne, that is, *venially*, and *veniall sinnes* may stand with grace and with perfect obedience of the law. This distinction is one of the rotten pillars of the *Romish Church*; t'will come in fit place to bee examined hereafter: for the present, we say, He that sinnes *venially* (as they mince it) breakes the law; and againe a man *Regenerate* may sinne *mortally*; which is true not onely according to their doctrine, who teach that a man may fall from the grace of *Regeneration* which to doe is a *mortall*

sinne: but much more according to the scriptures and experience which witnesse that *Peter*, *Dauid*, *Solomon*, and many, yea all the Saints, haue at sometime or other their grieuous falls; out of which, notwithstanding, by the grace of the *Holy Ghost*, abiding in them they recouer themselues so that finally they fall not away.

The last Argument is from the examples of such men as haue fulfilled the Law.

7. *Argum.*
b Gen.17.1.
c Gen.6.9.
d 1.King.14.8
e 2.King 13 25
f 2.Chr. 15 17
g Luke 1.6.
h Ioh.17.6.
i Phil.3.15.

7 *The Scriptures record that diuers men haue been perfect in fulfilling the law in all things*: as [b] *Abraham*, [c] *Noah*, [d] *David*, [e] *Iosiah*, [f] *Asa*, [g] *Zacharie and Elizabeth*, *the* [h] *Apostles*, *and other* [i] *holy men*.

Therefore the Law is at least possible to be kept by some.

Not to stand on particular examination of all the places of *Scripture*, which are alleaged for proofe of these examples; we answere briefly. That it is euery mans duty to aime at perfection in his obedience, according to Christs Commandement, *Mat.*5.48. *Be yee therefore perfect, even as your Father in heauen is perfect.* 2 That in this life there are many degrees of grace, which God bestowes diuersly on diuers men, according to his owne pleasure, and their greater or lesse diligence in the practise of *Holinesse*. So that comparatiuely some men may be said to be perfect, because farre more perfect then others, as the greatest starres be said to be of perfect light, because they shine brighter then those of lesser magnitude, though yet not so bright as the Sunne. But 3. we affirme that no man in this endeauour after perfection goes so farre, as for *inward holinesse* and *outward obedience* to answere the perfection of the law in all points. Even in these holy Saints which they bring for instance, the Scriptures haue recorded vnto vs their fallings, that in them at once we may see a patterne of *Holinesse* to be imitated, and

an

an example of humane infirmity, to be admonished by. We haue [a] *Abraham*, sometimes misdoubting of Gods promise and protection, and helping himselfe by a [b] shift scarce warrantable. [c] *Noah* ouer-seene in drinke. [d] *Dauid* breaking the sixth and seauenth Commandements one after another. [e] *Iosiah* running wilfully vpon a dangerous enterprise against Gods commandement. [f] *Asa* relying on the king of *Syria* for helpe against the king of *Israel*, and not vpon the Lord, [g] and in a rage imprisoning the Prophets for reproouing him; [h] and in his disease seeking not to the Lord: but to the *Phisitians*. [i] *Zacharie* not giuing credence to the Angels message. The [k] *Apostles* all at a clap forsaking, or denying Christ. We cannot then in these Saints finde perfection in the full obedience to the Law; amongst whose few actions registred by the *holy Ghosts* penne: we may read their sinnes together with their good workes. And had the Scriptures beene silent in that point: yet who could thence haue concluded, that these men or others had no faults, because no mention is made of them? It was Gods purpose to relate the most eminent, not every particular action of their liues; euen Christs story falls [l] short of such exactnesse.

a Gen.15. 2.3.
b Gen. 20.11.
c Gen.9. 21.
d 2.Sam. 11.
e 2.Chron 25 v.20.21.22.
f 2.Chr. 16.7.
g Ver.10.
h Ver. 12.
i Luk.1.18.
k Mar. 14.50. 66.&c.
l Ioh.20.30.31

Wee conclude then notwithstanding these Arguments. Our second *Proposition* standeth firme and good (*viz.*) *That no man in this life can fulfill the law in every duty both inward and outward: but that the iustest man on earth will faile in many things*. So if he should seeke for *Iustification* by this his actual obedience to the law: he throwes himselfe vnder the curse of the Law. *For cursed is every one that continues not in* [*all*] *things, which are written in the booke of the Law to doe them*, saith the [m] Apostle out of [n] *Moses*. Which curse must needs light on those, that are of the *workes of the Law*, that is, seeke for iustification and life by the

m Gal.3. 10.
n Deut.27 26.

the obedience of the law, which yet they cannot in all things perfectly obey.

CHAP. III.

No man in this life can performe any particular good worke, so exactly that in every point it shall answere the rigor of the Law, proued by conscience, Scriptures, reason, and Popish obiections answered.

3 *Propositi.* I Proceed vnto the last *Proposition*, which concerneth *Mans actuall obedience to any one particular precept of the Law.* Wherein will appeare the third imperfection of mans obedience in fulfilling of the Morall Law. We haue seene. That no man hath perfect inherent *sanctity* free from natures corruption. Againe, That no man can performe perfect actuall obedience to all and every duty of the law without fayling in any one point. And this much our adversaries will not much sticke to yeeld vnto vs, and confesse. That there is no man, but sinneth at some time or other; and that tis scarce possible to avoid *veniall sinnes*, as they stile them. But then they deny vtterly. That a man sinnes in every particular good worke; though he cannot doe all perfectly, yet in some hee may exactly fulfill the *Righteousnesse of the Law*, not missing in any one circumstance. And therefore at least by that obedience hee may bee iustified. This opinion of theirs hath neither truth in it selfe: nor yet brings any benefit at all to their maine purpose in prouing iustification by workes. For to what end serueth it them to stand quarrelling for the perfection of our obedience in some one or two good workes; when yet we faile in many things besides? One thing well done

done will not iustifie him that doth many things ill. For that of St *Iames* must bee a truth: *He that keepeth the whole Law, and yet faileth in one point, is guilty of all. Iames* 2. 10. Much more guilty is hee, that keepeth it in a few: and breakes it in many. But yet further, wee reiect this opinion also, as an errour: and wee teach on the contrary. That

No man in this life can performe any one particular good worke. so exactly; that in euery point, it shall answere the rigour of the law, and the seuere tryall of Gods iudgement.

About this assertion our aduersaries raise much stirre & many foule slanders against vs, proclaiming vs to all the world, open enemies to all good workes, that we bee Factors for the Kingdome of darknes, promoting as much as in vs lyeth all licentiousnesse in evill courses, and taking off the courage and endeauour of Men after pious duties. For who will set himselfe (say they) to doe any good worke if the Protestants doctrine be true, that in doing of it he shall commit a mortall sinne? Who will pray, fast, and giue almes, if when he doth these things he cannot but sinne? As good then it were to doe euill as to doe good: a man can but sin, and so hee shall let him doe his best. These slanderous incongruities fastned on vs, spring not out of our Doctrine rightly vnderstood: but out of froward and peruerse hearts, that will not see the truth. Such aspersions will easily bee wiped off, when after the confirmation of the truth wee shall make answeres to such obiections, as seeme to infringe it. We say then. That no man can performe any good work required in the Law with such exact obseruation of euery circumstance: that (were it examined by the rigour of the Law and Gods iustice) no fault at all can bee found in it. This wee prooue by *conscience*, by *Scriptures*, by *Reason*.

Firſt we here appeale vnto the *conſcience* of man, the iudgment whereof is to bee regarded; and wherevnto we dare ſtand in this matter. Thou that boaſteſt that in ſuch & ſuch good workes; that thou haſt not committed any ſinne at all. Dareſt thou indeed ſtand to it, and vpon theſe termes appeare in Gods iudgement? Dareſt thou abide the ſtrictneſſe of this examination ſtanding ready to iuſtifie thy ſelfe againſt euery thing that hee can obiect? Wilt thou venture thy ſelfe vpon this tryall euen in the beſt workes thou doſt, that God cannot with his moſt piercing eye of iuſtice ſpy a fault in them, if hee number them, hee ſhall finde nothing ſhort? If he weigh them not one graine to light? Againe let conſcience ſpeake, when thou haſt prayed, faſted, giuen almes, done any other excellent worke of *pietie* and *Charity* in the deuouteſt, and moſt vnblameable manner thou thinkeſt poſſible. Thinkeſt thou verily, that in this caſe thou needeſt not at all ſtand in need of Gods fauour, to paſſe by thine infirmities, and that thou needeſt not euen in this behalfe to pray; *Lord forgiue mee my treſpaſſes?* What man durſt ſay or thinke in any good worke: Lord in this particular I doe not deſire thou ſhouldeſt bee mercifull vnto me? Without doubt there is no man liuing vpon earth that ſhall in ſerious conſideration of the ſeuerity of Gods iudgement, and the great infirmity of his owne nature, compare his owne obedience with the ſeuerity of Gods iuſtice, but his heart will preſently ſhrinke within him, and his conſcience ſhunne this tryall; as much as euer *Adam* did Gods preſence. The thought of ſuch a ſtrict proceeding in iudgement, would make the proudeſt heart to ſtoope and tremble, the boldeſt face to gather blackneſſe, filling the ſoule with an horrible feare in the expectation of that day; ſhould the moſt innocent life, the moſt holy actions of men be there

ſcanned

scanned according to the rigour of iustice: not gratiously pittied, pardoned, & accepted according to that mercifull loue of God which coūereth and passeth by multitudes of sinnes. Twere arrogant pride in any man to vtter that speech in a sober temper; Where into *Iob* breakes out in a passion, chased by the sense of his miserable tortures; and the froward disputes of his friends. [a] *Oh* (saith he) *that a man might pleade with God, as a man pleadeth with his neighbour.* And againe, *Lay* [b] *downe now, put me in a surety with thee, who is he that will strike hands with mee?* And againe, *Oh that* [c] *I knew where I might finde him, that I might come euen to his face, I would order my cause before him, and fill my mouth with arguments. I would know the words which he would answere mee, and vnderstand what he would say vnto mee.* Speakes the man reason or is he beside himselfe? What? challenge God to dispute with him, and hope to make his party good in the quarrell? This was *Iobs* infirmity; Its our aduersaries arrogancy, who dare set their foot against Gods; & bid him pry as narrowly as hee list into their good workes: they will maintaine the righteousnesse thereof against all that he can obiect to proue the least *sinfulnesse*. *Iob* saw his folly: God grant that these may theirs; In a calmer temper, when conscience was not ouerclouded with griefe and anger: he reads vs a quite contrary lesson. In the 9 Chapter of his booke. *How should man bee iust with God If he contend with him he cannot answere him one of a thousand*, v.2.3. And againe, hauing reasoned and questioned of Gods wisdome and power, not to be questioned or resisted by any. *How much lesse shall I answere him* (saith hee) *& chuse out my words to reason with him? Whom though I were righteous, yet would I not answere: but I would make supplication to my iudge*, v.14. 15. Further, *If I would iustifie my*

[a] Iob.16.21.
[b] Iob.17.3.
[c] Iob.23.3.4.5

selfe, mine owne mouth will condemne mee, If I say I am perfect, it shall proue mee peruerse. Though I were perfect yet would I not know my soule, I would dispise my life, v.20.21. And once more. *If I wash my selfe with snow water, and make my hands neuer so cleane, yet shalt thou plunge mee in the ditch, and mine owne cloathes shall abhorre me. For he is not a man as I am that I should answere him, and wee should come together in iudgement.verse* 30.31.32. See this holy Saint, who elsewhere stands peremptorily to the defence of his innocency and vprightnesse against that wrongfull imputation of hypocrisy which his friends charged him with. all, telling them that till he die; he will not take away his innocency from himselfe, nor his heart shall not reproue him of his daies: yet when he sets himselfe before the Tribunall of Gods iustice, he dares not stand out in his owne Iustification, but submits himselfe to the mercy of his iudge, with humble supplication for his fauour. These confessions of *Iob* be not complements out of a fained and needlesse modesty: but the fruits of a conscience rightly informed and apprehensiue of its owne sinfulnesse, & the seuere rigour of Gods iudgement. The serious meditation of which two particulars, wee commend vnto our aduersaries, and all other of their humour; that are apt to entertaine fauourable & gentle opinions touching their sinns: and withall to nourish high conceits of their owne goodnesse. Whence they grow by degrees to thinke, that Gods iudgement is like their owne foolish imaginations; and where they out of blindnesse or selfe-loue cannot see a fault: that there God himselfe can finde none. Wee hardly see beames in our owne eyes: are wee then so skilfull to spy the smallest mote? Who can vnderstand his faults (saith *Dauid*) wilt thou answere him; Yes I doe? A secret fault may soone slip in, a deceitfull heart

Psal.19.

may

may in one circumstance goe beyond thy witt and watchfulnesse. Here then humility would doe well, and prayer for thy ignorances; for thy secret sinns; vnknowne to thy selfe as much as others. Here true modesty would haue her place, that thou preferre Gods wisedome and iudgement aboue thine owne, remembring that he iudgeth not as man iudgeth: but sometimes otherwise then thou doest, accounting that abomination, which in thine own eyes is much set by; & alwaies more exactly then thou canst; seeing much euill in that where thou seest little, & some euill where thou think'st there is none. And therefore alwaies speake vnto thy selfe in those excellent words of Saint *Iohn*; *if mine heart condemne (as in many things it doth) God is greater then my heart and knoweth all things.* 1 *Iohn* 3. 20. God forbid then that in any thing I should presume to plead with him in my Iustification. *He is wise in heart and mighty in strength; who hath hardned himselfe against him and hath prospered, Iob* 9.2. Thus much touching our first argument, from the inward witnesse of the conscience. Which in the most innocent life, often in the most holy worke, drawes backe from Gods iudgement seat, and is afraid to put it selfe vpon the tryall of his seuere iustice.

Wee haue the Scriptures to witnesse vnto vs the same Truth. *Psal.* 143. 1. 2. [*Here my prayer O Lord giue eare vnto my supplication: in thy faithfulnesse answere mee and in thy righteousnesse.*] Here the prophet seemes to appeale to the *Iustice* of God requiring his helpe vpon such termes, as if God out of pure iustice could not haue denyed him. But tis nothing so. Tis the mercy of God the holy Prophet sues vnto. Answere me in thy faithfulnesse and righteousnesse, that is, in those grations promises, wherein thou hast made mee to trust, whereupon I doe rely. *Thou art iust*

& faithfull in keeping promise, be so to mee in my distresse, who according to thy promise seeke vnto thee for succour. Vnto this righteousnesse of God *Dauid* presents himselfe, and his supplications; but before that strict & seuere Iustice of God he dares not stand, but in all submissiueneſſe prayes in the next words. [*And enter not into iudgement with thy seruant.*] He craues merciſull audience of his prayers: but deprecats the strict examination of his life and doings. He knew well that if God should deale with him vpon so hard termes; his owne innocency could neuer haue made his prayers acceptable *(For (*saith he) *in this shall no man liuing be iustified.)* The force of this place [a] *Bel.* seeks to decline by three poore miserable shifts. That *Dauid* would not haue God enter into iudgement with him to iudge him *(scilicet)* according to such things as hee had of himselfe: but according to such things as God had giuen him, that is, *Iudge mee not according to that righteousnesse which I haue by nature: but according to that righteousnesse which thou hast giuen by thy grace.)* Which interpretation how ridiculous a *phantasy* it is, and quite besides the meaning of the Prophet, tis easy for any one to iudge by reading of that *Psalme. Bell.* therefore hath another string to his bow: but as rotten as the former.

a Lib.4.c. 20.

Noli iudicare ex his quæ in me habeo.

2 2 That the place is meant of veniall sinns without which a Man cannot liue, and though they bee small faults: yet would it be no iniustice in God to punish them. So that the meaning is, [*Lord enter not into iudgement,*] that is, Lord *I will not contend with thee I confesse my selfe a sinner and craue pardon*, Diuerse small faults I haue committed not against the Law but besides the Law, and thou maiest easily pardon them. My case is not singular. I doe therein, but as other men doe, amongst whome, there is none so iust but some

some time failes and offends. And therefore doe not lay such faules to my charge. Men of corrupt conscience that thus sport with sinne and play with the Scriptures. The Iesuite must bring vs better proofes, then hee doth, elfe wee shall neuer beleeue that *Dauid* was a man of *Bellarmine* his mind touching *Veniall sinns*. That doctrine is part of the dregs of corrupted nature, maintained by *Popish Moabites*, who are setled on their *Lees*, infatuated by the Loue of sin, and flattering themselues in that *wickednesse* as little and light which God accounted worthy to bee hated. Wee acknowledge no *Veniall Sinns*: but such as deserue eternall death, which hereafter wee shall make good. And therefore if *Dauid* would not that God should enter into iudgement with him, because of *Veniall sinns* that accompany his holiest practises, tis in effect, that which wee say; the difference is only in an *Epithete*. Wee say *Dauid* prayed not to come into iudgement, because [*his best workes were sinfull:*] and *Bellarmine* addes, *because venially*, or, *pardonably sinfull*. Which aduantageth him not a iot. For let him mince it, how him list: tis manifest, that these were such sinnes, as for them *Dauid* durst not venture his best workes to come vnto the Barre of Gods seuere iudgement. There is yet another deuise.

That thirdly *Dauid* speakes by comparison. (*viz.*) 3
that though the righteousnesse of his workes were true, being absolutely considered: yet being compared with Gods Righteousnesse, it seemed to be *vnrighteousnesse*. As a candle set in the sunne seems to haue no light: and a little light compared to a greater, seems darknesse. Whereto we answere that *Dauid* here makes a confession of his owne sinfulnesse; not a comparison of his owne righteousnesse, with the righteousnesse of God. Hee desires that God will

not

not enter into iudgement with him; not because hee had not so much righteousnesse as God, in comparison of whom it seemed little or nothing: but because hee was sinfull, and had not so much *Righteousnesse* as hee should. Man may haue a *Righteousnesse* of his owne; infinite degrees, below the *Righteousnesse* of God, which yet may passe the tryall of Gods iudgement without all reproofe. As is manifest in the *Rigteousnesse* of *Adam* and *Christs* Humanity: both which though inferiour to Gods *Righteousnesse*, were yet able to endure that strict examination. Wherefore wee are not accounted vniust for that imperfection, because we haue lesse *Righteousnesse* then our maker: But because wee haue not so much as wee ought to haue, according to the capacity of our nature wherein he made vs. But of this more hereafter. Let this serue for the clearing of this first place of Scripture, and the exceptions against it.

2 The second place of Scripture, is that, *Isa. 64. 6. But wee are all as an vncleane thing, and all our righteousnesse is as filthy raggs, and wee all doe fade as a leafe, and our iniquities like the wind haue taken vs away.* This is the confession of the Church of God, submitting her selfe to him in the acknowledgement of her sinns, and the iustnesse of his anger against her. The confession is euery way generall: both for *Persons*, not one excluded; *Wee all* כלנו *are as an vncleane thing*, and likewise for workes, none are excused from faultinesse. *All our righteousnesse* (nay in the plurall) *all our righteousnesses* כל צדקותינו *are as filthy raggs.* Hence they acknowledge that God is iustly angry with them, and that in his righteous displeasure, they are afflicted, consumed and brought into great aduersity, the glory of the Church, and state decaying more and more, like a fading leafe that falls, from the tree, and is driuen away with the winde

winde; *And we all doe fade as a leafe, and our iniquities like the winde haue taken vs away.* Against this plaine acknowledgement of mans ſinfulneſſe in all his moſt righteous workes, the *Ieſuites* except diuers waies.

1 That the *Prophet* ſpeakes here in the perſon, not of the godly: but of the wicked, who make here this confeſſion of their ſinnes. And how proue they this? Thus. The Text ſaith, *Behold thou art wroth, for we haue ſinned.* Now God is not angry with the Godly: but with the wicked. Againe, the Text ſaith, *There is none that calleth vpon thy name.* that is, none of the wicked perſons, for the godly doe call on Gods name. This exception is manifeſtly refuted by the whole order of the Text, whereby it is apparent to any that hath but halfe an eye, that this recognition of ſinne, & praier for mercy beginning at the 15. *verſ.* of the 63. *Chapter*, to the end of the 64. *Chapter*, is made by the whole Church, and all the faithfull therein, confeſſing their owne faults, as well as others, and ſuing for reliefe, not only in behalfe of others, but of themſelues too. His reaſons are worth nothing. God is not angry with the godly, ſaith *Bellarmine*, No? Then *Peter* is in an errour, who ſaith, 1. *Pet.* 4. 17. 18. *The time is come that iudgement muſt beginne at the houſe of God; and if it beginne at vs, what ſhall the end of them bee that obey not the Goſpell of God; And if the righteous be ſcarcely ſaued; where ſhall the vngodly and ſinner appeare?* Heres iudgement on Gods houſe, that is, on the righteous that obey the Goſpell, as well as on the vngodly that obey it not. And ſo tis, when the godly ſinne, they ſmart for it, in priuate afflictions, in publique calamities, both waies they finde God is not well pleaſed with their ill doings. When a Church and a State is ruinated, may not the moſt righteous take vp this confeſſion. *Lord thou art angry for we haue ſinned.* Euen we by our

ſinnes haue haſtned and increaſed the publique miſeries? I trow, none will deny it. Againe, the Text ſpeakes of thoſe that doe not call vpon Gods name. But the godly call vpon it, *Ergo*, tis not meant of them. True, they doe call vpon Gods name: but is this done alwaies with that diligence, with that zeale which God requires? How comes it to paſſe then, that the godlieſt men are many times ſecure, ſlothfull, cold and careleſſe in the duties of Gods moſt holy worſhip? Yea, in the corrupt and declining times of the Church this happily is their fault chiefly, who themſelues begin to freeze in ſo general a coldneſſe of the ſeaſon, looſing much of that fetuency of Spirit which the Apoſtle requires of vs, as at all times: ſo then eſpecially, when it ſhould reuiue and put heat into others, when their loue of religion begins to wax cold. At ſuch times zeale in Gods ſeruice, vehemency in prayer, conſtancy in all religious exerciſes, reſolute, but diſcreet forwardnes in the holy profeſſion of religion is moſt commendable. But yet it ſo comes to paſſe, that euen then much ſecurity and ſlackneſſe ouercomes the godly, and whileſt they ſhould be a meanes to prevent a miſchiefe, they haſten it vpon themſelues and others.

And thus the Iewiſh Church here in this place confeſſeth that there were none that called on the name of the Lord, a careleſſe negligence, & ſlackneſſe in the ſeruice of God, was come vpon them, ſo that as it is in the next words, [*There was none that ſtirred vp himſelfe* מתעורר להחזיק בך *to take hold of God.*] None awaked and rouzed vp himſelfe with diligent endeauour to apply himſelfe to the worſhip of God, a fault wherewith God may iuſtly bee angry: as hee then was. This firſt exception then is frivolous. Others there be as idle.

2 That by [*all*] in this place is to be meant the *greateſt part*

part, not all the *Iewes*, nor all their workes were sinfull; but the *greatest part*. For so the word [*All*] is taken in some places of Scripture: and therefore the *Iesuites* thinke, it must needs be taken so here.

3 That if it be meant of [*all*] simply: yet tis not to be vnderstood at all times. All the *People* and their works were naught and sinfull, when they were to be carried away captiue: but it followes not, that they were so at other times.

4 This must be restrained to the righteousnes which consists in obedience to the *Ceremoniall* Law. [*All our Righteousnesse*] that is, *all our Ceremoniall workes in Sacrifices, Obseruations of Sabbaths, New-moones, Fasts and such like*, [*are as filthy clouts*] being done in that manner as we doe them (*viz.*) without *Faith and Obedience*. To these we say that there would neuer bee an end, were a man bound punctually to refute every cauill, which an aduersary may frame out of his fancy-full imagination, and froward heart. Wee owe the Romanists no such credit: as to assent to any point of *Religion* vpon their bare affirmation. Wee can as confidently deny such exceptions as these, without yeelding the a refutation: as they doe boldly make them without bringing any proofe. And certainely most vaine and vngodly is that course which our aduersaries or any that tread in their steps doe hold in their disputations, about serious points of Christian doctrine: when being vrged with convincing Scriptures, they thinke they haue done the part of *Schollers*, and satisfied the *Consciences* of others desirous of truth, if they can amaze and stonny you a little with two or three interpretations and pretty exceptions, and so leaue you to chuse which you list. They will not tell you which they will stand to: but euen when their answers crosse one another, yet all shall downe, that if one helpe not, another may, and

altogether may vex you, when they cannot satisfie you. This quarrelsome humour of men, who seek not the truth in loue: but write to maintaine dispute, is not the least vexation of the spirit, and wearinesse to the flesh of man; as all those will witnesse, whose much reading hath lead them along into the perplexed mazes of *Schoole-learning*, whether *Divine* or *Humane*.

The third place of Scripture is, *Psal.* 130.3. *If thou Lord shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord! who shall stand?* This place is parallell to the former, wherein the holy Prophet desires God to be attentiue to the voice of his supplications, craues this audience meerely of Gods fauour; not vpon any righteousnesse or worth of his owne. As for that hee confesseth. That if *God should be strict to obserue* wherein hee and all men doe amisse: neither himselfe, nor any other could bee able to stand in his presence. Whence hee flies from his iustice vnto his mercy. *But there is forgiuenesse with thee that thou maist be feared. vers.* 4. Presumption then it is, and arrogant pride for any *Romanist* to say, Lord if thou doe obserue iniquities: yet I shall be able to stand. In such and such good workes, bee extreame to marke what is done amisse: I feare not the triall, nor will sue to thy mercy.

From Scriptures we come to reason. Which is thus.

Whereseeuer there is *concupiscence* and inordinate motions of the heart; whereseeuer there's a defect of charity towards God and man; Whereseeuer *veniall sinnes* (as our aduersaries call them) are mingled with good workes: there the *best workes* of men are not free from some corruptions and sinfulnesse.

But in a man *Regenerate* there is *concupiscence* and evill motions of the heart present with him, when he would doe good; there is a want of that measure of loue to God, & charity

rity to man, which he might and ought to haue, there alſo are beſides many *veniall faults* that accompany his beſt workes.

Ergo, the workes of a man Regenerate are not every way good: but in part ſinfull.

The *Minor* is cleere and confeſſed by our Adverſaries: eſpecially for the two former circumſtances of *concupiſcence*, and imperfection of charity: and for *veniall ſinnes*, they alſo acknowledge it a very hard matter to avoid them in any good worke. Wherefore they are [a] driuen in a deſperate manner to deny the *Maior* and to avouch. That neither *concupiſcence* nor imperfection of *Charity* to God or our Neighbour; nor yet *veniall ſinnes* mingled with good workes, doe at all impaire the goodneſſe and perfect righteouſneſſe of our obedience to the Law; but that they are as good with thoſe infirmities, as without them. Bad cauſes muſt be helpt out, by bold and deſperate attempts; and ſo it fares with our aduerſaries in this point. They will vtterly deny that there is any thing euill in a man Regenerate: rather then bee forced to confeſſe there is any thing euill in the workes that he performes. The impudent vnreaſonablenes of this their aſſertion, we ſhall ſhorty ſpeak of. In the meane wegoe on vnto the conſideration of ſuch arguments, which are brought by our aduerſaries to proue; That the good workes of men *Regenerat*, are truly & perfectly good, without all *faultineſſe* in them. They proue it then.

a *Bell.l.4.c.17.*

1 *Firſt from the examples of Iob and Dauid. Of Iob is ſaid. Iob.1.22. In all this Iob ſinned not, nor charged God fooliſhly, and chap.2.verſe 10. In all this did not Iob ſinne with his lippes. Againe for Dauid: he is conſcious to himſelfe, of his owne innocency, and that no fault can be found in his doings, wherefore he prayes, Pſal.7.8*

Bell.lib.4. cap. 15.17. Becan.Tom 2. tract 2. cap.2. quæſt 4. & 6.A. quæſt.1.

Iudge me, O Lord, according to my righteouſneſſe, and according to mine integrity that is in me. And after all this, Pſal. 18. 23.24. *Hee profeſſeth openly his innocency, and reward for it. I was, ſaith he, alſo vpright before him, and I kept my ſelfe from mine iniquity. Therefore hath the Lord recompenced mee according to my righteouſneſſe, according to the cleanneſſe of my hands in his ſight. And Pſal.*17. *verſ.*3. *Hee declares how God had throughly tried him: and yet found him faultleſſe. Thou haſt proued mine heart, thou haſt viſited me in the night, thou haſt tried mee, and yet ſhalt finde nothing: I am purpoſed, my mouth ſhall not tranſgreſſe. How then can any man ſay that Iob and David ſinned mortally in their ſayings and doings: when God himſelfe witneſſeth for them that they doe not ſinne?*

Hereto we anſwere. That we doe not lay *ſinne* vnto the charge of thoſe holy men: nor doe we ſay they did ill, where the Scriptures witneſſe they did well. *Iob* in that firſt Act of his tryall quitted himſelfe well, and ouercame the temptation. He ſinned not as afterwards he did, breaking forth into impatiency: & that is all the ſcripture meant by that ſpeech *In all this Iob ſinned not.* But whether *Iobs* patience were in this firſt conflict every way ſo vnreproueable, that not the leaſt fault could be ſpied in it, in Gods ſeuere iudgement, is more then we dare affirme, or our Adverſaries will ever bee able to proue. For *David*, his innocent demeanour of himſelfe, in the time of *Saules* raigne was ſuch: that no imputation of vnfaithfulneſſe or ambition could iuſtly be laid to his charge. Wherefore when *Saules* followers accuſe him of treaſon againſt their Maſter: *David* appeales vnto God, deſiring him to deale with him according to his innocency in that behalfe. His owne conſcience, and God with his conſci-

ence

ence, after triall made, acquit him from plotting and practising against *Saul*, as his Aduersaries said he did. Thence it followes that *David* did not offende in that kinde whereof his Adversaries accused him. His heart was vpright; his life was innocent, neither his Aduersaries could make proofe, neither did his conscience accuse him, or God condemne him of these faults, that he was charged withall. Thus far *David* durst stand to Gods iudgement; that hee was innocent in those particular evills, whereof man had accused him: but it followes not therefore hee durst enter into iudgement with God: and plead, that God himselfe could finde no fault at all with him. He might haue many secret faults and imperfections euen in this most innocent passage of his life; which neither himselfe knewe, nor his enimies could come to the knowledge of: and therefore though he dare plead his righteousnesse before God, so farre as man can accuse him of vnrighteousnesse, yet hee dare not goe further to cleere himselfe against all that God may obiect against him. Heare what himselfe saith in this case, *Psal.* 139. 23. 24. *Search me, O God, and knowe my heart, try mee and knowe my thoughts.* Speakes the Prophet this out of confidence, that God vpon search and triall, shall finde no evill in his heart & thoughts? No, but out of holy desire, that whatsoeuer evill is found in him may be amended. Hee knowes well that many things may be found faulty in him: and therefore hee stands not to iustifie himselfe: but onely sues for grace to redresse them; adding in the next words. *And see if there bee any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.*

2 They proue that the workes of men *Regenerate* are not *sinfull* by the *Scriptures* which call them *good workes*, & say that they are *pleasing vnto God.* 1. That they are *good.* [*Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good*

good workes] *Math.* 5.16. [*Charge the rich that they doe good and be rich in good workes*] 1.*Tim.*6.18. [*Wee are his workmanſhip created in Chriſt vnto good workes*] *Eph.*2.10. [*Why trouble yee the woman; for ſhee hath wrought a good worke vpon me.*] *Mat.*26.10.2. That they are alſo pleaſing vnto God is apparant by theſe places. *Yee are made* [*an holy Prieſthood to offer vp ſpirituall ſacrifices, acceptable to God by Ieſus Chriſt*] 1.*Pet.*2.5. *In the Epiſtle to the Philippians, The Apoſtle calleth their almes ſent vnto him* (*an odour of a ſweet ſmell, a ſacrifice acceptable, well pleaſing vnto God*] *Phil.* 4.18. *Againe.* [*To doe good and to communicate forget not, for with ſuch ſacrifices God is well pleaſed*] *Heb.*13.16. Hence they argue. *If the workes of men regenerate bee good and acceptable vnto God: then certainely the Proteſtants erre in their doctrine, teaching that the beſt workes of Men are ſinfull for as much as ſinne is neither good in it ſelfe, nor any way pleaſing vnto God. Who is infinitely offended at all iniquity.*

Herevnto wee anſwere. That this argument is nothing, but a froward and wilfull miſtake of our doctrine. Wee teach, that the beſt workes of the beſt men are in part ſinneſull. They thereupon cry out that wee take away all goodneſſe from the workes of the Godly, and that wee account them to be [*in ſe.*[a] i.e. *Ex natura ſua*] damnable and mortall ſinnes. This is a fooliſh calumny of men that cannot diſtinguiſh betweene the diſeaſe and the diſeaſed body: but ſtraightway conclude that the whole body it ſelfe is nothing elſe, but a meere rotten vlcer, becauſe it hath ſwellings and ſores in ſome part of it. Wherefore to vnfold their eyes in this point, they are to vnderſtand that wee make a neceſſary & true diſtinction between *That which is ſinne & that which is ſinfull*: teaching that the good workes of the

[a] Perverting *Calvins* words *Ne vnum à ſanctis* (*exit*) *opus, quod ſi* (*in ſe*) *cenſeatur non meretur iuſtam opprobrii mercedem Calu. Inſt. l.3.c.14. §.4.*

Regenerate

Regenerate be not sinns, though they be sinfull. Wee explaine it thus. That is to be called *Sinne* in its owne nature, which is the transgression of the law in doeing any act forbidden; or in leauing vndone any act commanded by the Law. The omitting, or committing of any such act is properly [b *in se & ex Naturâ suâ*] a *sinne*. Because it is directly and totally in the very substance of it against the Law. As to pray to a false God, or neglect prayer to the true God, are both of them sinnes in their very proper natures: because both are forbidden by the morall law. That wee call *sinnefull*, which is for the maine substance of the worke conformable to the Law; but it failes and offends against the law in some circumstances required in the doeing of it, when the thing is done which the Law commands, but not perfectly in euery point as the Law commands it: such a worke: we say, is not a *sinne*, though it bee sinfull; there is *sinne* in it, but it is not all *sinne*. This distinction our Aduersaries cannot but admit of, as in the *workes of the Heathen and Christians vnregenerate:* so in the good workes of the *Regenerate* themselues. Wee and they confesse that the morall vertues of the *Heathen* were good and commendable in the *substance* thereof: nor doe wee thinke there is any man so deuoide of reason, as to affirme that the *Iustice, temperance, Chastity, Liberality* of a *Heathen*, are meere *vices* and *sinnes*. Wee all grant, they were *vertues:* but yet our Aversaries themselues cannot affirme, that they were euery way vertuous, free from all spots and staines of c *Vice*; seeing they had neither faith & sanctity from whence they sprung; nor the glory of God at which they aimed. Now as the vertues of the naturall man, are in part vitious: so the *good workes* of the *Regenerate* are in part sinfull. To fast, to pray to giue almes, with the like workes of *Piety* or *Mercy*,

b *Bell.l.4 c.17.* erres in saying (*opera bona ex genere sue ex obiecto, sed mala ex circumstantijs, non sunt bona simpliciter: sed mala (s. simpliciter) quoniam bonum non exijt nisi ex causa integra: malum vero ex quolibet vitio*) And it is false which he addes that God doth simply condemne (*facto*) almes-deeds, &c. don with a bad intention for vaineglory, &c. God doth not simply condemne the worke: but them for their ill doing of it.

c *Sunt vitiata non vitia.*

we affirme and teach that they are *good workes*, good in their nature and vse: being such actions as the Law commands. Wee know none of our side so farre gone with passion, as to maintaine that a godly man sinnes because hee fasts, prayes, and giues almes; as if those very acts were nothing but damnable sinne. Wee detest such franticke opinions; and if any of our writers haue let slip such words, as may giue occasion to our aduersaries, so to thinke of vs; we doe not, nor are wee bound to iustifie euery hot and cholericke speech, breathed out in eagernesse of disputation. *Good workes* they bee, truly and verily *good:* but they are not perfectly good. When a good man prayes he doth well: but he neuer doth so well; but he may doe better. Nor dare any man in the world auouch: that either the root whence *good actions* come, is purged by perfect holinesse: or the manner of doing them, is so exactly kept in a precise obseruation of euery circumstance, or the end in doing them Gods *glory*, and mans *good*, so syncerely and truely aimed at: that the *seuerity of Gods iustice*, cannot finde any the least failing in any of those things. This is all we teach touching the *sinfulnesse of good workes*, and thus wee stand too, as a most certaine truth. And wee say *That this sinfulnesse* accompanying our good workes, is sufficient to barre vs from *Iustification* by them. For wee deserue not reward for what is well done, except all were well done. But neuertheless it shall not hinder Gods gratious acceptation of our *good workes*, who is well pleased with the obedience of his children, so farre as it is good and holy: and when it failes, for *Christs* sake he mercifully pardoneth their trespasses. Thus much of the second Argument. The third is from reason grounded on scriptures.

3 *Where there are* (sufficientia principia rectæ operationis)

tionis) *sufficient causes and meanes of well doeing: there a good worke may bee done without all fault---- But in a man regenerate, there are causes and meanes sufficient for well-doing ----- Ergo, Hee may doe well, and not offend.*

They proue the *Minor* thus. *To the performance of any good worke, there is required nothing, but these things. Knowledge of what is to be done, will and power to doe it ----- But now a regenerate man hath all these. For first, his vnderstanding is enlightned, so that hee can easily know what is good to bee done. Secondly, his will and affections are sanctified and aided by grace, to desire and endeauour the performance of it. And thirdly, and lastly, hee hath power to put in practise what hee knowes & desires, there being no impediment inward, or outward that should hinder him --- Ergo, he may doe well and sinne not.*

Here wee desire them to shew vs how a man *Regenerate* is endued with such perfect abilities, as may helpe him: and quite rid him of all such impediments, as might hinder him in well doing.

*This (*say they) *is done by the grace of sanctification, giuen vnto a Regenerate man, whereby he is freed from all contagion of sinne: and such incumbrances, as hinder him in well-doing. For by this grace giuen to him, hee is made a good tree: now [A good tree cannot bring forth bad fruit, Mat. 7. 18. ---- And ergo, a good man cannot doe bad workes. Againe, hee is made a fruitfull Branch of Christ the true vine, as it is Iohn 15. 5. I am the Vine, yee are the branches, he that abideth in mee, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit. And Ergo, That fruit only which is good. Which similitude of a*

Branch much illustrates the matter (in their imagination.) *For as in a vine-branch. If first it haue sufficient moisture from the body of the vine. Secondly, if it haue sufficient heat of the sunne to digest that moisture. And thirdly, if it bee not hurt nor hindred by Frosts, Wette, windes, wormes, or other such discommodities of the Ayre and soyle; then certainely it will beare very much, and very good fruit: so is it in a man regenerate. From Christ he receiues sufficient moisture of diuine grace, which is in him,* [*as a well of water springing vp vnto euerlasting life. Iohn* 4.14.] *He hath heat sufficient of spirituall affection, to cause him to bud forth into good workes. For Christ saith* [[a] *I am come to send fire on earth, and what will I if it bee already kindled. Luke* 12.49. *And* [*Did not our hearts burne within vs*] *said the two disciples that went to Emaus, Luke* 24.32. *Ergo, they haue heat enough. Finally, they haue no impediment. Neither inward. For why? It is written, Rom.*8.1. *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Iesus. Ergo, no inward impediment to well doing. Nor outward. For it is written,* [*nothing shall separate vs from the loue of God, that is in Christ Iesus our Lord, Rom.*8.38. *Ergo, no outward impediment of good workes.*

[a] Ridicule.

Herevnto wee make answere. That this argument is a *sophisticall* cauillation; which proues that which wee doe not deny. They say that a man regenerate, hath *sufficientia principia recta & honestæ operationis.* We say so too; confessing that hee is made a good tree, a fruitfull Branch; that hee is enlightned; sanctified, and strengthened by the spirit of God vnto the performance of *good workes.* Wee grant that now he is enabled to doe well, who before his *Regeneration* could doe

doe nothing saue ill: but the question still remaines, whether now he doe so well, as that he doth nothing ill when he doth best. Wee grant that the *Vine*, which in former time yeelded nothing, but wild grapes, now being transplanted and grafted into the best *Vine*, beares good grapes: but we deny that they are so weet & kindly in euery respect, as not to haue a little relish still of their former wildnesse & sowrenesse. Wherefore our aduersaries doe but trifle with vs to tell vs that man regenerate hath meanes sufficient to doe those workes that be good: this we deny not; but we question whether they haue helpe sufficient to performe any worke so absolutely and perfectly good; that God himselfe cannot charge it with any sinne at all. This wee constantly deny. And to their discourse, *(That a Regenerate man hath sufficient knowledge, power and will to doe good perfectly)* in this they affirme more then will euer bee proued. Our imperfections in euery one of these three particulars witnessed to our conscience by *Scripture and experience* doth disable vs euer from doing any worke entirely and totally good. Knowledge we haue: but much darkned by ignorance. We haue a will to doe good: but that also corrupted with much froward Rebellion. A power we haue to doe good: but alwaies crossed and much restrained by manyfold Lusts within, and Temptations without vs. How is it possible for vs, being compassed about with so many infirmities: but wee should offend in one thing or other, *Becanus* here brings vs an instance of a good worke: and bids vs shew what sinne there is in it *If (*saith he*) A man regenerate reade or heare these words of Christ. Mat. 6. [giue almes] he being enlightned knowes that this is a worthy and honest worke. Whereupon he is touched in heart and stirred vp to doe it. Hee consents to this motion, and resolues vpon the execution, which*

(*supposing that hee be rich*) *nothing now can hinder because he is both able and willing to giue. Now then this almes being thus giuen out of knowledge, and a pious motion of the heart tending to Gods honour and our neighbours good, the Iesuite desires to know of vs, where there is any sinne in it.* Wee say there is some euill in euery good worke & therefore hee would haue vs tell him what euill there is in this *Almes deed.* Vnto this we say, that this enquiry of the *Iesuite* is the most ridiculous and absurd thing that can bee. He asketh vs where is the sinne? What if we answere him *we doe not know*; Is he now euer the wiser? What hath hee gained thereby? Are other mens worke without all faults because we know not what they bee? Nay, are they without fault, because themselues know not whether there bee any within them: or no? What sillinesse were it to argue in this sort? Therefore when wee come to this point strictly to examine the workes of men. First wee tell the *Iesuite* that hee must not *put cases* touching *generalities* [*suppose that such a good worke bee done so and so what then*] wee dispute now touching particulars in euery *Mans reall practise.* The enquiry is not for the generall. (*What euill is there in such and such a good worke*) *done thus and thus, according as the circumstances are framed in an imagined case.* As to aske what sinne is therein an almes-deede done out of *Faith and charity to Gods glory.* This is a fond question thus framed vpon generall termes we say there is no sinne in it. But the enquiry is in particular, what euill there is in such a worke done by this or that man, according to all circumstances, that were at that time incident to the worke, as. *what sinne was there in Zacheus or Cornelius almes-deeds?* This question we admit and answere to it, that some sinne there was for which those holy men, as well as others, would not haue beene

beene willing that God should enter into iudgement with them, strictly to iudge them. Yea, but will the Iesuites reply, name what sinne this was; or else you wrong them. Now this is meere impudency. For who is iudge of their actions? Are wee? Or is it God and their owne *Consciences?* wee can be no iudges, who at furthest can iudge but according to outward appearance. We know not their *Hearts:* nor are we privy vnto euery particular circumstance, that did accompany those actions of theirs. Circumstances in euery particular action differ infinitely, one man may offend in this point, another in that: nor haue wee a *generall rule* whereby to iudge alike of all. And therefore it is a childish *quere* to aske one man whether another man offends, who may doe euill a 1000 times, not only *secret* from others, but *vnwitting* to himselfe. If then the *Iesuite* will haue an answere to his question, hee must resort to particular mens Consciences, and to God: for only the *spirit* of Man, and the *spirit* of God knowe the things of Man. Let him aske a *Cornelius* when he giues almes, whether hee doe thinke this worke so well done, that no fault can bee found with it. Doubtlesse he will answeere, that he cannot excuse himselfe from all faultinesse: though hee knew nothing by himselfe, yet he dares not stand to Gods iudgement. His confession and prayer would in this case be the same with *Nehemiahs.* *Nehem.*13.22. [*Remember mee O my God concerning this also, and spare me according to the Greatnesse of thy mercy.*] at once begging fauourable acceptance of his obedience, & gratious pardon of his infirmities. If this suffice not in the next place, the *Iesuite* is to repaire to God almighty and question him, wheres the *sinne* in such & such *a good worke*, who no doubt can shape him an answere that will soone confound his *pride and folly*, and make it quickly appeare vnto

vnto him, that sinfull man, when he pleades with God, is not able to answere him one obiection of a 100, that God shall make against him.

This of the third argument. That man hath sufficient meanes to doe well and not sinne. The last followes, drawne from such absurdities, as they say doe follow vpon our Doctrine. Thus.

4 *If (say they) our doctrine bee true that the best workes of men be sinfull: then these absurdities be likewise true doctrine. That to be iustified by faith is to be iustified by sinne. That no man ought to beleeue, because the worke [Beleeuing] is sinne. That all good workes are forbidden, because all sinne is forbidden. That God should command vs to commit Sinne: because hee commands vs to doe good workes. That God bidding vs be zealous of good workes, should in effect bid vs be zealous of mortall sinne. That to pray for the pardon of sin were a damnable Sinne. These and such other absurd Positions would be true: if the Protestants doctrine concerning the sinfulnesse of good workes may stand for good.*

Hereunto wee answere. That these absurdities issue not out of our Doctrine, but out of our aduersaries malitious *Imaginations*. Who like the raging Sea casting vp mire and Dirt from its owne bottome, would faine throw all this filth in the face of the *Reformed Churches*, to make them odious and hatefull to the world. The best is. Truth cannot bee disgraced though it may be belyed. These foule absurdities touch vs not: but follow vpon that Doctrine which is none of ours. Namely, *That the good workes of the Regenerate are in their very nature altogether sinne, and nothing else but sordes, inquinamenta, & meræ iniquitates.* Such an absurd

absurd assertion would indeed yeeld such an absurd consequence. But we defended it not: and they abuse vs grosly, when in their writings they report of vs the contrary that we doe maintaine. This onely wee teach. *That mens good workes are in part sinfull.* Much good they haue in them: but withall some euill mingled therewith. Amongst the gold some drosse also will be found, that will not bee able to abide the fire of Gods seuere triall. Imperfections will appeare in our best workes, so long as humane infirmity and mortality hangs vpon vs. This we teach, and from this doctrine all that haue reason, may see that no such vnreasonable conclusions can be collected. And let thus much suffice for the clearing of this third *Proposition,* touching the imperfection of our obedience to the *Morall Law of God,* euen in the *good workes* which we performe. From whence every godly heart should learne both *Christian humilitie* and also *Industrie.* First, *Humility* not to boast in the flesh & glory in its owne *Righteousnesse*, thinking that God must highly account of, and reward largely, that which is very little worth. Secondly, *Industry* in a faithfull indeauour after perfection. That what cannot be done well as it ought, may yet every day be done better then before it was.

CHAP. IV.

Three generall exceptions against the truthes delivered in this third Section.

THus we haue stood long in the confirmation of our second Argument, touching the *impossibility of Mans fulfilling of the Law* in this life, and so consequently *of iustification by the Law.*

Against all that haue beene said for the proofe of this point; our Aduersaries haue three *Common* and *Generall*

Exceptions. Which are these.

1 *That concupiscence or naturall corruption in the first and second act of it, is not sinne.*

Bel.l.4.c.17. & passim alibi

2 *That imperfection in our charity and obedience is no sinne.*

3 *That smaller faults, or* (as they call them) *Veniall sins, doe not hinder the iustice & goodnesse of any good worke.*

1 Except. To these three *Positions* they haue continually recourse. For whereas they cannot deny; but that there is in the *Regenerate*, both a proneſſe of nature vnto evill, and also many inordinate *sinfull motions* arising thence: they first deny, that either these *Naturall corruptions, or disordered motions* of the heart be any *sinnes*.

Againe, they confesse that no man hath such perfect *loue* of *God* and *Man*; but that he may increase in *charity*: nor be his good workes so perfectly good; but that they ought still to striue to doe them better: but then here also they deny, that this imperfection of our charity and good workes, is any sinne.

Lastly, they grant that no man can avoid *veniall sinnes*, learse in the best workes he doth: but then they deny that *veniall sinnes* be contrary to the Law, so that albeit a man commit them, yet he may perfectly fulfill the Law of God. I cannot stand largely in the refutation of these foule errors. The confutation whereof belongs properly to the *Article of remission of sinnes*; where the nature and kindes of sinnes are to bee handled. For this present I shall touch on them briefly, and proceed to the matter.

Conclusion 1 For the first; we defende this *conclusion*.

The vitious inclination and proneneſſe of nature vnto evill, as also the inordinate motions of concupiscence which

which goe before consent, they are sinnes euen in a man regenerate.

That the inclination and proneneſſe of nature to ſinne is a ſinne, we proue thus. 1

It is expreſly ſo called by the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 7. not once nor twice: but almoſt in euery verſe of the Chapter. *I am carnall ſold vnder ſinne. The ſinne that dwelleth in me v.* 17. 20. *The law of ſinne, verſ.* 23. 25. In it ſelfe it is ſin, & deſerues the wages of ſinne, eternall death. For which cauſe the Apoſtle there calls it. *The body of this death*, verſ. 24. Becauſe this inward corruption (which is like a body that hath many members conſiſting of diuerſe euill affections ſpreading themſelues throughout his whole nature) made him lyable vnto eternall death, from which only Gods mercy in Chriſt could deliuer him. 1

2 To rebell againſt the Law is ſinne. *Ergo*, To haue a rebellious inclination is ſinne likewiſe. For if the act be euill, the habit muſt needs be naught: if the Law forbid one; it muſt needs forbid the other. If it be euill to break any Commandement in act: is it not euill to haue a proneneſſe and readineſſe of minde to breake it? The habit denominateth a man ſinfull and not the act. Nor doth God leſſe abhorre the proneneſſe of man to offend him: then wee doe abhorre the rauenous diſpoſition of a Wolfe, though it be a Cubb, not yet vſed to the *prey*, or one tied vp in a chaine, and kept from rauening. 2 Iam. 3. 12, 13. Iam. 4 8. Cleanſe your hands: purge your hearts.

The euill motions of the heart without conſent be ſinnes. 2

1 They are forbidden in the Morall Law. In the tenth Commandement. *Thou ſhalt not couet.* For motions with conſent are forbidden in the other Commandements. As appeares manifeſtly in *Chriſts* expoſition of the Commandements. *Mat.* 5. 22. where not only the outward act of A- 1

dultery: but the inward desire is also forbidden; if wee beleiue *Christ* the best *interpreter* of the Law: When *Ergo* the tenth Commandement forbids *coueting* [*of our neighbour wife*, it either meanes the same kinde of lusting, with a needlesse *Tautology:* or a different, *viz.* that which is not consented vnto. Nor can our Aduersaries shift this off: though *Becanus* most impudently denies it, without any reason of his so doing.

Tom.2.p.885.

2 2 We proue it thus. Whatsoeuer is inordinate and repugnant to the right Reason: that is sinne.

But these motions without consent be inordinate.---- *Ergo* they be sinne, the *Minor* is confessed. That these motions be *inordinati & rectæ rationi repugnantes.*

The *Maior* is apparant. For what is *Ordo & recta Ratio in Moralibus*: but that course of doing any thing, which is conformable to Gods Law and his will. God is the God of *order*. His Law is the *rule of order* in all *humane actions*. *Recta ratio* what is it; but the *conformity of mans vnderstanding* and will vnto Gods will, which only is the *rule of righteousnesse*; Wee neuer purpose and will matters *aright*: but when we will them agreeably to Gods will. Wherefore it is a grosse absurdity to deny the *sinfulnesse* of these disorderly motions: seeing no man can breake those orders which God hath made, and yet be faultlesse. Nor is it possible a man should doe that which is contrary to Gods will: And yet bee without sinne in doing of it. These motions then without consent bee *confusions in nature*, *opposites* to the *righteousnesse* of the will of God, and vnto that euen & streight *order* expressed in his Law.

Marke them that walke disorderly, ἀτάκτως, i.e. sinfull, otherwise according to the Law.

Wee conclude then that *Concupiscence* and inordinate motions of the *Soule* not consented vnto, are *Sinnes* contrary to our Aduersaries assertion.

They

They bring some reasons to proue they are not.

1 *Originall sinne is taken away in Baptisme. But concupiscence is not taken away in Baptisme; as appeares by experience in the Regenerate, in whom it remaines. --Ergo, concupiscence and proneness to sinne is no sinne.* 1. Arg. adv.

This Argument is frivolous. In *Originall sinne*, there are two things, first, *the guilt*. Secondly, *the inherent corruptions*. Wee say in *Baptisme* the *guilt* is altogether washed away from the *Baptized Elect*, by the blood of *Christ*. And soe the *corruption* thereof, it is in part done away by the *sanctifying spirit of Christ*, powred out vpon the *Regenerate*, which by degrees purgeth out the inherent *sinfulnesse* of nature, by replanting the *graces of Sanctification* in all parts. Concupiscence then, notwithstanding *Baptisme* remaines in the *Regenerate*, & is a sinne in them, the guiltinesse whereof God mercifully pardons in Christ.

2 *What is not in our power to avoid: that God doth not forbid vs by his Law.*
But tis not in our power to avoid the motions of the heart that preuent reason and consent. Ergo, they be no sinnes forbidden vs. 2. Arg. adv.

To this we answere. The *Maior* is true in things meerely *Naturall*, that fall out by the *Necessity* of nature well disposed. So we say, Gods Law were vncouth, should hee command a man neuer to be an hungry or thirst, which things he cannot avoid, but they come vpon him, will hee, nill hee; by the meere necessity of nature. But concerning inordinate motions, there's no such matter. God hath laid no such necessity on nature in her creation: but wee by our sinne haue brought it vpon our selues.

Now such a *necessity* excuses vs not. In this case it helpes

a man no more to say. [*I cannot auoid evill thoughts & desires.*] then it doth a desperate sinner, that by continuance hath hardened himselfe in euill courses; or then it helps the Diuells and the damned, if they should say; *We cannot chuse but doe evill.*

3.Arg.adv. 3 *They argue thus. That which would haue beene naturall and without fault in man, if hee had beene created,* in puris Naturalibus; that is, *no sinne nor fault in vs. But motions preuenting consent, would be naturall, and without fault in men so made. Ergo, In vs they be no faults in themselues.*

Here our Aduersaries haue made a man of white Paper, or the like to *Materia prima:* that hath not any quality in him *morally* good or bad. That is, a man that hath neither the Image of God in *knowledge, righteousnesse,* and *holines,* engrauen on his *vnderstanding, will, affections,* and whole person; nor yet, though it haue it not, hath in him any contrary euill *quality,* that comes vpon him by reason of such a defect. Now of such a *Wiseaker* they dispute. If God had created a man thus, *in puris naturalibus,* neither good nor bad, then. What then? As the old word is. *If the Heauens fall we shall haue Larkes good cheape.* Suppositions framed by our imaginations touching what might bee done, are vaine and needlesse when we see what is done. This we see that man was created in Gods image, inuested with all *Reall Qualities* of *Righteousnesse* and *Holinesse.* This wee see also, that man being fallen is borne in *Originall corruption,* depriued of God's image, and therevpon depraued in his whole nature by *sinfull infirmity.* Wherefore a man in his pure *Naturals,* one that hath neither *Grace,* nor *Corruption,* was neuer found in this world: yea, 'tis a contradiction to imagine a man thus naked without his *Qualities*; that hee hath

hath *Reason*, but neither enlightned, nor darkned, a will but meerely indifferent, neither inclined to good, or euill; affections, but neither vertuously, nor vitiously disposed. In a word, that he is a man capable of *Vertue*, or *Vice*; *Holinesse*, or *sinfulnesse*, and yet hath neither. That were to make a man little better then an *vnreasonable Beast*. But to follow them a little. Suppose a man were made in his *pure Naturals*, would such disorderly motions be found in him? Yea, say they, and that boldly. *Si homo crearetur à Deo in puris naturalibus, procul dubiò constaret duabus partibus repugnantibus, Spiritu & Carne: & haberet duos appetitus contrarios, Rationalem & Sensitivum; ergo naturaliter haberet quosdam motus repugnantes Rationi.* Without doubt the *Iesuite* is deceiued in this his imagination, and his Argument is not worth a Button. A man in his pure naturalls should haue two parts, a Soule and a body, *Spirit* and *flesh*; hee should haue two appetites, *Reasonable* & *Sensuall*, *ergo*, these parts in their motions and desires would bee contrary one to the other. This consequent is false. They would be diuerse, not opposite and repugnant. The Body & the *Sensitiues* would lead a man to those things that are agreeable to the body. The *Soule* and reasonable *appetite*, or will would incline him to those higher and more noble obiects agreeable to the *Soule*. But neither of these inclinations would crosse & trouble one another, the inferiour *faculties*, like the lower *Spheares* would moue differently from the *superiour*: but yet most orderly according to their owne nature, without impeaching the motions of the other. Each faculty in it's place would worke orderly in sweet harmony and agreement each with other, had not *Sinne* brought in *confusion* and *discord* into the world, as betweene God and man: so betweene man and himselfe. This wee further make good by

Becan. Tom. 2. tract. 4 cap. 4. quæst. 1. sect. 2.

by this argument. Whatsoeuer is naturall, and so without blame in the Man: that *Christ* tooke on him. ---But these inordinate motions of the *sensitiue appetite*, repugnant vnto *Will* and *Reason*; *Christ* took not on him----*Ergo* they are not *naturall*, and without blame. The *Maior* wee proue by that, *Phil.*3.7. *He was made like vnto man*: and *Heb.*2.17. *In all things it behoued him to bee made like vnto his Brethren.* And againe, *Chap.*4.15. *Wee haue not a high Priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities: but was in all things tempted in like sort: yet without sinne.* Whence 'tis manifest that *Christ* taking on him our nature, tooke on him all the properties of our nature, and with all such infirmities of our nature as are not sinfull in themselues, or the effects or punishments of *Sinne* in vs. If therefore it be naturall vnto Man, that the motions of the *sensitiue appetite* should prevent and be *repugnant* vnto *Reason*, and that this is no *Sinne* except consent make it so: then certainely *Christ* had in him such motions and inordinate desires. But to affirme that, there were in *Christ* such disorderly motions of his inferiour faculties, repugnant vnto his *Reason* and *Will*, is a blasphemie against the *immaculate Lambe of God. Christ* was indeed tempted (as the text saith) and in like sort as we are: but will any man here vnderstand this of inward *Temptations* arising from any thing within *Christ*, as if hee were like vnto vs drawne aside with [b] *Concupiscence* and inticed, the motions of his sensitiue faculties, inclining him to that which was contrary to his vnderstanding and will? Wee confesse that he was fiercely tempted by *Satan* and wicked men from without: but that he was tempted by any thing in himselfe, by disorderly motions of his heart tending vnto evill, and *ergo* checked by his will and reason, this wee account an abominable errour touching the *spotlesse humanity*

[b] Iam.1.14.

ty of our *Sauiour*. Wherein we deny, that there euer was any the least disorderly desire, thought, word, or work whatsoeuer. And therefore wee conclude, that such motions are not *naturall* vnto men, becomming sinfull only by accident, because they are consented vnto: but they are *accidentall* vnto him, being the fruit of *originall corruption*, and are in themselues *verily* and properly *Sinnes*.

For *Conclusion* of this point, let vs heare that *Argument* which *Bell.* makes. 4 Arg. Bell. Lib.4.cap.11.

4 *Where there is no law, there is no sinne. Rom.*4.10. *But there is no Law prescribed vnto sense and sensuall appetites. Ergo The motions thereof are not sinfull.*

The *Maior* wee grant. The *Minor* he proues *because the Law presupposed Reason in all that whereto it is giuen. But the sensitiue part of man is without reason, and ergo not capeable of a Law, according as it is in bruite beasts, to whom ergo no Law is giuen.* This hee further proues by that place, *Rom.*7.20. *Now if I doe that I would not, it is no more I that doe it, But sinne that dwelleth in mee. Where 'tis plaine (*saith *Bell.*) *that the Apostle did not sinne, because he lusted against his will. 'Twas not he did the worke: but 'twas the sin in him.* Wherefore he saith afterward. *That in his mind,* i.e. *in his superior faculties hee serued the Law of God: and kept it: although in his flesh,* i.e. *sensitiue appetite and inferior faculties he serued the Law of sinne: yet, for all that he sinned not in so doing, because sinne cannot be but in the minde, and the law is not giuen to those faculties that be vnreasonble.*

To this wee answere. That God giues no law to vnreasonable *Creatures*, but such as haue *Reason*. The *sensitiue faculties of bruite-beasts* haue no other *Rule* then *Natures*

instinct, which guides and moderates their seuerall motions in due order and measure. But in man those inferiour *faculties* how euer *vnreasonable*, are yet capeable of *Reasons Gouernment*, which according to Gods Law prescribes vnto the motions of the *sensitiue appetite* their measure and bounds, beyond which they may not passe. If a man were vncorrupt, the appetite would obey this rule of Reason and keepe it selfe within those prescribed bounds. But being now corrupt by sinne, it breakes out beyond this compasse and ouerbeares *Reason and will*, which in their sinfull weakenesse are not able to bridle these vnruly motions. Wherefore when *Bell.* saith. *That the law is giuen to the reasonable will; not to the sensitiue appetite*; it is vtterly false; Because in man it is capeable of gouernment, and so subiect to the Law. Our *Reason* hath euen in this our corrupted estate a ciuill command ouer our appetite & affections; so that it can moderate them by faire perswasions now and then. That which it can doe sometimes, it ought to doe alwaies, and if any affections can obey reason at sometimes, were they not infected with *sinne*, they would doe it at all times. And if they doe well when they obey, certainely they doe euill when they disobey. And *ergo* such motions of them, as are repugnant to right reason, are nothing but *rebellion* against Gods Law. As to the place in the 7. *Rom.* we answere. That that interpretation of it which *Bell.* brings is most peruerse and against all sense. The Apostle complaines that he did the Euill, which he would not; no doubt in so doeing he did *sinne*. But what is it now which committed this guilt or sinne? *It is not I that doe it saith the Apostle: but that sinne that dwelleth in mee.* That is, according to *Bell:* not I in my mind, or superior faculties of *Reason and will*: but my inferior appetite and affections which doe

doe this euill against my consent. So the meaning shall bee *Concupiscence* in that duell in the Apostle committed sinne: but the *Apostle* himselfe committed it not. Which is very absurd. As if a *Cholericke man* hauing done a mischiefe in his anger should say, it were not he did it; but his raging passion: or an *adulterer*, that 'twas not hee committed the sinne; but his sinfull affection that carried him further then *reason* would. So that if God will punish such a sinne; hee must not punish him: but only his sensitiue *appetite* which was in fault. That is ridiculous, for besides that it crosseth the *Romish* Doctrine manifestly; in teaching that such disorderly motions of the *sensitiue appetite* be no sinnes, which here the *Apostle* contradicts, saying plainely (*that the sinne which dwelt in him did doe the euill hee would not.*(viz. *Sin*) it drawes after it this grosse error. *That some faculty in man may sinne, and yet the man not sinne himselfe.* Wherefore the Apostle in that speech. '*Tis not I doe it: but sinne in mee*, doth not oppose one faculty against the other, the *reasonable will*, against the *sensitiue appetite*, seeking for a shift to excuse his sinne, by putting it off from himselfe, to that which was not capable of *Sinne*: but he opposeth *grace* in euery *facultie* to *Corruption* in the same facultie; as two contrarie *Principles* and *causes* of his *actions*, one mouing to good; the other enclining to bad. Thence the Apostle saith, that (when he doth euill) '*tis not I that doe it* i. e. I regenerate according to the Grace, that dwelleth in me, for that inclines me to doe good: but 'tis *the Sinne dwelling in mee* which (when I would doe well) inclines mee to doe euill. He heere shewes the *roote*, whence this euill comes: but yet he doth not put off the fault from himselfe. As 'tis himselfe doth well: so 'tis himselfe doth ill too, according as hee concludes. verse 25. *Then I my selfe:* ἐγὼ αὐτὸς doe both well &

ill; well, according to grace, *in my minde* that is *regenerate part* both of inferior and superior *faculties. I serue the Law of God* but ill according to corruption remaining in mee: *but in my flesh*, the vnregenerate part, *the Law of Sinne.* Much more might bee added: but 'tis not my purpose, here to enter vpon the common place at large.

I proceed to the second question of our aduersaries, who teach that *albeit our loue of God be imperfect: yet this imperfection is not sinne in vs.* They grant. That no man hath any *grace* of the *spirit:* but hee may encrease in it daily, that the loue of God and our Neighbours may still grow on to farther degrees of affection; that no grace, nor good worke hath that full perfection, which it might haue in this life, or which wee shall attaine vnto in Heauen. But they deny this *defect to be any fault or sinne.*

2 Exception. Bell. lib. 4 cap. 10. & 17. & cap. 20.

2 *Defectus Charitatis quod* (viz.) *non facimus opera nostra tanto feruore delectionis, quanto facimus in patriâ, defectus quidem est: sed culpa & peccatum non est.* saith Bell. and againe *Charitas nostra quamuis comparata ad Charitatem beatorum, sit imperfecta: tamen absolute perfecta dici potest.*

This is an error against which wee defend this *Conclusion* in generall, touching both charity and all mans *Righteousnesse.*

Conclusion. contr.

The defects or want of perfection in mans Righteousnesse is Sinne.

For the proofe of this point wee are to obserue, that the *Imperfection*, or *Perfection* of any thing is to bee considered of two waies.

1 *Comparatiuely.* When any thing set by another is more or lesse perfect, then that other.

2 *Absolutely.* When considered in it selfe, it hath or wantes

wantes that *perfection* which it should haue by its proper Nature.

Betweene these three is great difference. For Comparatiue imperfection is not euill: absolute imperfection is euill. Wee may see it in an example. The sences that are in man being compared with their like in other creatures, tis manifest they are much excelled by them, as by an Eagle for sight, a spider for touch, &c. Here wee say that the eye of a man is not so perfect as the eye of an eagle: but yet wee doe not account this imperfection any *Naturall euill* of the eye of a man. God might haue ginen a stronger and a clearer sight to men: but wee, blame not his workes; nor count our sight imperfect because it hath not that singular temper which is in other *Creatures*; but because it wants at any time that temper which is agreeable to our nature. Such a defect only, is properly an euill in nature, when something is wanting to the perfection of any part, which by the course of nature should be there. Thus tis also in Grace. Compare we the *Righteousnesse* of man, or *Angels*, with the *Righteousnesse of God*; we saie that God is *infinitely* more perfect then the *Creatures*. But now is this *imperfection in humane or Angelicall righteousnesse* any euill and Sinne in them? We say no. Neither are the *Angels* sinfull because lesse righteous then God: nor *Adam* sinfull because lesse righteous then either. God made them both lesse good then himselfe: yet *very good*, and without all sinne. There be degrees of *Righteousnesse*, and though the creature bee infinitely below the highest pitch of *goodnesse* (which is God:) yet he may be still aboue that lowest desent vnto *sin* and *vnrighteousnesse*. In *Philosophie* wee dispute whether the slackening of any degree in one *Quality*, bee the mingling of another that is *contrary*. As heat in eight degrees

if it decrease vnto seauen, whether there is any degree of cold mingled with it. 'Tis hard to say that there is. But concerning *Grace* and *Righteousnes* 'tis certaine, there is that *remissio graduum* without any *admixtion* of *Sinne* & *iniquity*. As the *Holinesse* of *Saints* is lesse then that of *Angels*; that of *Angels* lesse then the *Holinesse* of *Christs* glorified *Humanity*, this lesse then his *Deity*. And yet in the least of these *Righteousnesse* there is no *vnrighteousnesse* at all to be found, no not in the seuere iudgement of *God*. Except we say there is *vnrighteousnesse* in *Heauen* where no vncleane thing can enter. Well then. What Imperfection of mans righteousnesse is it, which is *Sinne?* We say. That *Imperfection*, when man in any *Grace* or good *worke* wants that degree of goodnesse, which hee ought to haue. As in nature. If the eye want the clearenesse of sight which should be in it: 'tis a naturall euill. *In morality* if a man want that *Temperance* or degree of *Temperance* he ought to haue, its a *vitious* and morall euill: so in *Grace* the want of that *righteousnesse* or degree of *Righteousnesse* which *God* requires to be in man, is a *Sinne* and *spirituall* euill. All such *priuations* of what should be present are euill in what kind soeuer. If they be in nature they be *mala miseranda*; deserue pitty and cure: if in *Vertue* and *Grace*; they bee *mala culpanda* worthy of blame and punishment. Such defects as these in *Grace*, when man falls short, not only of that which is in others; but that which should be in himselfe, doe alwaies arise from the mixture of *Corruption* and *sinne*. He that loues not God or his neighbour so much as hee ought to doe: 'tis becaus his heart is wicked, at the least in part; and that hee loues other things more then he should doe. These things are certaine and vndeniable according to those words of St *Augustine* that are *authenticall*. [a] *Profectò illud quod minus est*

[a] *Epist.29. ad Hieron.*

est quam debet, ex vitio est. And againe. [b] *Peccatum est, vel cum non est charitas, quæ esse debet: vel minor est quam debet.* 'Tis a sinne, not to loue God at all: or to loue him lesse then we should. Wherefore here wee aske the *Iesuite* whether *Charity* & other *Graces* in a man *regenerate* bee so perfect in this life, as they ought to be? If he say, they be not so perfect, as they ought to bee, how can hee affirme that this defect is no fault nor *Sinne:* Can a man possibly doe worse, or be worse then he should; and yet be in no fault therefore? If he say they be as perfect as they should be, his owne *Conscience* and the *Conscience* of all the men in the World will gain-say him for a liar. No man can say, that he loues God and his neighbour asmuch as he ought to doe: and that he is not bound in euery *grace* and *good worke* to ariue at greater pefection, then he hath for the present. Hee that thinkes himselfe come nearest vnto the marke, will yet be driuen to confesse, that he falls many bowes short of those patternes which he ought to imitate, *Adam* in his *Innocency*; *Christs Humanity*, and the Saints in *Heauen.* Wee here bid them *(Depinge vbi fistam)* make a point where wee shall stoppe: that when wee are come so farre, wee need seeke no further perfection. If they cannot doe this, then they must confesse, as the truth is, that euery man is bound by Gods command to be more holy, to bee more perfect in all *Grace* and *good workes*; and so farre as hee wants any degree or dramme of goodnesse, that should be in him and his workes, so farre he is sinfull and guilty of a fault.

[b] L. de perfect. Iustit. resp. 15.

3 I goe on to the last *Assertion* of our aduersaries, which is touching *veniall sinnes, (viz:) That these doe not hinder the righteousnesse of mens good workes. A man may be a perfect iust man, though he commit many veniall sinnes.* The reason whereof they make to be [*because veniall sinns are not contrary*

3 *Exception* Bell. li. c. 17.

contrary to charity, the loue of God and our neighbour, and so may stand well enough with the fulfilling of the law.]

Against this error, tending to the obduration of mans heart in impenitency and loue of sinne: wee maintaine this *conclusion*.

Conclusion contr. *Those sinnes which the Church of Rome calls veniall, doe truely make a man regenerate, & his workes vnrighteous in the sight of God.*

This wee proue by this one argument.

Whosoeuer transgresseth the Law he is vnrighteous in so doing.

But hee that commits veniall sinnes, transgresseth the Law. Ergo, He that commits veniall sinnes is an vnrighteous man.

The *Maior* is vndeniable. For the *Minor* our aduersarie is at a stand. They are loath to grant it: yet cannot tell how to deny it with any honesty. *Bellarmine* after one or two shuffling distinctions of *simpliciter*, & *secundum quid*; *perfectè* and *imperfectè*, at last plainely denies that *veniall sinnes* be contrary to the Law. For answering vnto those places in *Iames*. [*In many things wee offend all,*] and that in *Iohn*. [*If we say we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues.*] He saith they cannot handsomely shift themselues of those places, who hold that *veniall Sinnes* be [*propriè contra legem.*] Such as bee of that opinion [*Let them looke to it* (saith hee) *what they will answere to that of Saint Iames.*] *He that keepes the Law in one point, &c.*] He therefore will be more wise and wary. [*Solida igitur responsio est* (saith hee) *Peccata venialia, sine quibus non viuitur, non esse peccata simpliciter, sed imperfectè & secundum quid: neque esse contra Legem, sed præter legem.*] And thus saith he, *Omnia cohærent* (like Pebbles in a withe) [*Nam qui offendit in vno,*

Lib. 4 cap. 14.

preua-

praeuaricans scilicet vnum praeceptum, reus est omnium, & simpliciter iniustus constituitur & tamen in multis offendimus omnes, quia tametsi nihil facimus contra legem; tamen multa facimus praeter legem. Et qui natus est ex Deo, non peccat transgrediendo legem, & tamen si dicamus quia peccatum non habemus. (viz.) nihil praeter legem faciendo: nos ipsos seducimus, & veritas non est in Nobis.] This is an vnbound Besome, as will appeare by vndoing that distinction which seemes to hold it together. *Veniall sinnes* are not *against the law: but besides the law.* Well, we must now know what is against the Law, & what besides. That is against the Law, when any thing is done which the Law forbids, or left vndone which it commands. That is besides the Law, when the thing done is neither commanded, nor forbidden in the Law, Hee then that commits a *veniall sinne*, doth some such act as the Law neither forbids nor commands. Here then we aske. Bee *veniall sinnes, sinnes?* Yea, they be. Is God offended with them? Yea, and hee may iustly punish them on vs with the losse of heauen. For so *Bellarmine* himselfe confesseth. [*Peccata venialia nisi misericorditer remittantur impediunt ab ingressu illius Regni in quod nihil coinquinatum intrare potest.*] Now sure this is admirable, that such acts as these should defile a man, deserue hell, offend God, in a word be sinnes, and yet for all this neither commanded nor forbidden in any law of God. Was there euer such a toy heard of as this? As *sins* beside the Law. Tis a most ridiculous contradiction, *Peccatum praeter Legem.* Hee that doth any thing beside the law, not mentioned, nor included therein by way of *prohibition* or *command*, tis most apparent he sinnes not, nor offends not at all. For whom doth he offend, or who can challenge him of

Other meaning of these words (against) & (besides) there can be none given.

Lib.4. cap. vlt.

Sinne?

Sinne? Doth God the Law-giuer? No, for twas not his intention to command or forbid such an act, and *ergo*, bee it done or not done, it crosseth not his will: nor hath hee any reason to finde fault or be displeased at it. *Satan* or *Man* cannot accuse him. For let them then shew the Law that proues him an offender. If they cannot alleadge a law against which he hath transgressed: they wrongfully accuse him of a fault. Were it not an absurd acculation against a prisoner at the barre, to say that he hath indeed done nothing against the Lawes of the Land: but many things besides the Law not forbidden nor commanded in the Law, those hee hath done and deserues to be punished for it as an offender?

But now if those *veniall sinnes* bee mentioned in Gods Law: then are such actions either commanded or forbidden. If commanded, then the not doing of such a thing, is plainely contrary to the law. As for example. [c] To steale a penny, or some other small matter, to speake an idle word, to tell an officious lie; these bee *Veniall sinnes*, say our Aduersaries. But how knowe they, they bee *sinnes*? Who told them so? The Scriptures they will say. Where? In the 8 & 9 *Commandement*. Aske them now. Did God intend in those *Commandements* to forbid those actions of *stealing* and *lying*? Yea, or no? If he intended it not; then tis no sinne at all to doe them, seeing it crosseth not Gods will, nor offends him. If he did intend to forbid vs those things: then to doe them is a *sinne* manifestly contrary to the holy will of God, the Law-giuer. Wherefore let vs here remember that excellent rule of *Bernard*. [*Non iussa quidem licitè vtrumlibet, vel admittuntur vel omittuntur: iussa vero sine culpa non negliguntur, sine crimine non contemnuntur.* For things not commanded: wee may either lawfully doe them or leaue them: but for things commanded, to neglect them is a sin,

[c] *Vti vxore cõcupiscentiæ satiandæ gratia.*

Bern. de præcept. & dispen.

to

to contemne them is a haynous crime. Wherefore this distinction of sinnes against, and sinnes beside the Law falleth to dust: and our *Minor proposition* stands firme: That hee who committeth *veniall sinne*, transgresseth the law of God and therefore is vnrighteous for his so doing.

[a] *Becanus* here forsakes the *Cardinall* in this distinction: and helpes him by another deuise. Hee grants that *Veniall sinnes* be against the Law, and proues it, [*because euery Veniall sin is moraliter malum, and ergo contra rectam rationem & legem æternam.*] But heres now the distinction: It is one thing to be *contra legem*, another *contra finem legis*. All Veniall sinnes be against the law: but no veniall sinne is properly against the end of the Law, that is, against *Charity the loue of God* or our *Neighbour*. Is not this a superfine inuention? As if a *Subiect* that hath in many things broken the law, should say. True my faults bee against the law of the land: but yet they are not against the end of those Lawes. *viz.* obedience to my Prince, and loue to the good of him and my country. Though I breake the lawes: yet I would not haue you thinke, but I loue and honour my Prince and Country well enough. Iust so the *Iesuites*. A man may commit many sinnes against Gods law: and yet obserue the end of the law, in louing God with all his heart; and his Neighbour as himselfe. Then which nothing can bee more senseless that a man should offend God in breaking of his Law: & yet notwithstanding loue God with his whole heart. That a man should wrong his Neighbour doing that to him which he would not haue done to himselfe: and yet, for all that, loue his Neighbour as himselfe. (*If yee loue me keep my Commandements*) saith Christ, Iohn. 14. 15. Nay (say the *Romanists*) we loue him and yet breake his Commandements. (*Loue doth not euill to his neighbour*) saith the Apostle,

[a] *Tom. 2. tract. 2. cap. 2. q. 2.*

Nauar. Man. consest. prælud. 7. Num. 16.

*Rom.*13.10. Nay (say the *Iesuites*,) loue may doe euill to his neighbour: and yet keepe the name of loue. A man may be angry with another without cause, reuile him, and call him *Racha*, he may defraude him in small matters (for these they make *veniall sinnes*) & yet in the meane time, all this without breach of charity. Himselfe would not willingly bee so vsed: but he will vse another in this sort; and yet looke to be thanked for his loue too. Such grosse absurdities doe our aduersaries runne into, by coining such senseleſſe distinctions of (*Sinnes not against: but besides the law*) *of sinnes not against the end of the law: though against the law it selfe.* Our consciences cannot be satisfied with such silly shifts: & therefore we leaue them vnto those that can content themselues to choake vp their consciences with a little Sophistry. Men who make a pastime of sinne; and take liberty to qualifie and dispense with Gods law as they thinke agreeable to their conscience; hoping by *tricks of wit and dodging Distinctions* to avoid the accusations of conscience, & to elude the *seuerity of Gods iudgement.*

SECT. 4. CHAP. 1.

Iustification by works makes void the couenant of grace, of the difference betweene the law and the Gospell, of the vse of the law. Of the erroneous conceit of our aduersaries in this point.

THus much of these three exceptions of our second *Argument*, prouing the impossibility of our iustification by the workes of the law, because we cannot perfectly fulfill the law. We goe now forward vnto two Argements more; taken, the one

one from the difference of the two Couenants God hath made with man. First *of workes, the other of Grace: and the other from the nature of true Christian liberty obtained for vs by Christs death.*

3 *Argument. That which makes void the couenant of grace is a false and hæreticall doctrine.* 3. *Argum.*

But iustification by workes of the law, makes void the couenant of Grace. Ergo, Tis false and hæreticall so to teach.

For confirmation of the Minor in this Argument wee must briefly shew. 1 (*What the Covenant of Grace, what the couenant of workes is*) 2 *What opposition there is between these two.*

By the *Couenant of Grace* we vnderstand in one word, the *Gospell*, i.e. the gratious appointment of God to bring man to *Saluation by Iesus Christ.* In the administration of this gratious purpose of God we must obserue foure periods of time, wherein God hath diuersly ordered this meanes of mans salvation. *Couenant of Grace.*

1 The first is from *Adam* vntill *Abraham.* Wherein God made the promise to *Adam* anon after his miserable fall: and renued it as occasion serued vnto the *Patriarches* and *Holy* men of that first age of the world. *viz.* That (*the seed of the woman should breake the Serpents head*) This blessed promise containing the whole substance of mans *redemption by Christ*, was religiously accepted of, and embraced by the seruants of God in those times, who witnessed their faith in it, by their offering of sacrifice as God had taught them: and their *Thankfulnesse* for it, by their *Obedience* and holy *Conuersation.* *Period. 1.*

2 The second is from *Abraham* to *Moses.* After that men had now almost forgot Gods promise and their owne 2

duty: and *Idolatry* was crept into those *Families*, wherein by succession the Church of God had continued, Gad calls forth *Abraham* from amongst his *Idolatrous* kindred, and with him renues that former *promise* in forme of a League and Couenant confirmed by word & solemne *Ceremonies*. *God* on the one side promising to be the God of *Abraham*, and of his seed, *& that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed*: *Abraham* for his part beleeuing the promise, and accepting the *condition* of *obedience* to walke *before God in vprightnesse*. This *Couenant* with *Abraham* is ratified by two *externall ceremonies*. One of a *fire-brand passing betweene the peices of the Heifer* and other Beasts, which *Abraham*, according to the custome in making of Leagues had diuided in twaine, *Gen.* 15. The other the *Sacrament of Circumcision* vpon the *flesh* of *Abraham* and his posterity, *Gen.* 17.

3 The third period is from the time of *Moses* vntill *Christ*. When (after the Church multiplied vnto a Nation, & withall in processe of time, and continuance among the *Idolatrous Ægyptians*, grew extreamely corrupt in *Religion* and *Manners*) *God* againe reviues his former *Couenant* made with *Abraham*. Putting the *Iewes* in remembrance of the *Couenant* of *grace* in *Christ*. 1 By adding vnto the first *Sacrament* of *circumcision* another of the *Passeouer*, setting forth vnto the *Iewes*, the *Author* of their deliuerance; as well from the *spirituall* slauery and punishment of sinne; as from the bodily bondage and plagues of *Ægypt*. 2 Afterwards by instituting diuers Rites and ceremonies concerning *Priests sacrifices*, *&c.* all which were shadowes of good things to come (*viz.*) of *Christ*, the *Churches* redemption by his death. Which things were prefigured vnder those types though somewhat darkly, yet plainely enough to the weake vnder-

vnderstanding of the *Iewes*. Who in that *Minority* of the Church stood in need of such Schoolmasters and Tutors to direct them vnto Christ.

The fourth period and last is from Christs death, to the end of the world. Who in the fulnesse of time appearing in our flesh, accomplished all the *Prophecies* and *promises* that went before of him: and by the sacrifice of himselfe, confirmed that couenant a new: which so long before had beene made with the Church. Withall hauing abolished whatsoever before was weake and imperfect, hee hath now replenished the Church with abundance of knowledge, & of grace, still to continue and increase, till the consummation of all things. In all these periods of time, the grace of God that brings saluation to man was euer one and the same: onely the Reuelation thereof, was with much variety of *circumstances*, as God saw it agreeable to every season. In the first twas called a promise, in the second a couenant, in the two last Periods, a *Testament*; the Old from *Moses* till Christs death; the New from thence to the worlds end, in both *Remission of sinnes*, and *saluation* bequeathed as a Legacy vnto the Church: and this bequeast ratified by the death of the *Testator*, *typically* slaine in the Sacrifices, for confirmation of the Old: *Really* put to death in his owne *Person*, for the *Sanction* of the *New Testament*. But notwithstanding this or any other diuersity in *circumstance*, the substance of the *Gospell*, or couenant of *Grace*, is but one & the same, throughout all ages. Namely, *Iesus Christ yesterday, and to day, and the same for euer.* 4

In the next place. By the *Couenant of Workes*, wee vnderstand that we call in one word the Law: Namely, That meanes of bringing man to *Saluation*, which is by perfect obedience vnto the will of God. Hereof there are also two *Couenant.* 2 *Workes.*

seuerall

seuerall administrations. 1 The first is with *Adam* before his fall. When *Immortality* and *Happinesse* was promised to man, and confirmed by an externall *Symbole* of the *Tree* of *life*: vpon condition that he continued obedient to God, as well in all other things; as in that particular Commandement of not eating of the *Tree of knowledge of good and evill* 2. The second administration of this couenant was the renuing thereof with the *Israelites* at Mount *Sinai*: where (after that the light of nature began to grow darker, and corruption had in time worne out the characters of *Religion* and *vertue*, first graued in mans heart) God reuiued the law, by a compendious and full declaration of all duties required of man, towards God or his neighbour, expressed in the Decalogue. According to the tenor of which law God entred into couenant with the *Israelites*, promising to bee their God; in bestowing vpon them all blessings of life and happinesse, vpon conditiō that they would be his people, obeying all things that hee had commanded. Which condition they accepted of, promising an absolute obedience. *All things which the Lord hath said we will doe. Exod.19.24.* & also submitting themselues to all punishment in case they disobeyed; saying *Amen* to the curse of the law. *Cursed bee euery one that confirmeth not all the words of this law to doe them: and all the people shall say Amen. Deut.27.26.*

We see in briefe what these couenants of grace & workes are. In the second place wee must enquire what opposition there is betweene these two; *Grace* and *Workes*; the *Gospell* and the Law. The opposition is not in regard of the ende whereat both doe aime. They agree both in one common end, namely the glory of God in Mans eternall saluation. The disagreement is in the meanes, whereby this end may be attained; which are proposed to men in one sort by the Law,

Law, in another by the Gospell. The diuersity is this. *The law offers life vnto man vpon condition of perfect obedience, cursing the transgressors thereof in the least point with eternall death: The Gospell offers life vnto man vpon another condition, viz. Of repentance and faith in Christ, promising remission of sinnes to such as repent and beleeue.* That this is the maine *Essentiall* and proper difference betweene the *Couenant* of workes and of Grace (that is) betweene the Law & the *Gospell*, we shall endeauor to make good against those of the *Romish Apostasy* who deny it. Consider we then the law of Workes, either as giuen to *Adam* before the promise: or as after the promise it remained in some force with *Adam* & all his posterity. For the time before mans fall. It is apparant that perfect obedience was the condition required for the establishing of *Adam* in perpetuall blisse. Other meanes there was not: nor needed any be proposed vnto him. But when man had failed in that condition; and so broken the *Couenant* of Workes: God to repaire mans ruined estate, now desperate of euer attaining vnto happines by the first means: he appoints a second, offering vnto *Adam* a Sauiour; that by Faith in him, and not by his owne vnspotted obedience, he might recouer *Iustification*, and life which he had lost. So that what *Adam* should haue obtained by workes without Christ: now hee shall receiue by faith in Christ without Workes. Since the time of mans fall we must consider, that the Law and *Gospell* though they goe together, yet as they still differ in their vse and office betweene themselues; so also the Law differs from it selfe, in that vse which it had before, and which it had since the fall. To vs now, it hath not the same vse which it had in mans innocency. It was giuen to *Adam* for this end, to bring him to life, and for that purpose it was sufficient both in it selfe, as an absolute *rule* of

Perfection: and in regard of *Adam* who had strength to haue obserued it. But vnto man fallen, although the band of obedience doe remaine: yet the end thereof (viz.) Iustification & life by it, is now abolished by the promise, because the law now is insufficiēt for that purpose, not of it selfe, but by reason of our sinfull flesh, that cannot keepe it. This is most manifest by the renewing of the first *Couenant* of workes with the *Iewes*, when God deliuered vnto them the Morall Law, from *Sinai*, at which time God did not intend that the *Iewes* should obtaine *Saluation*, by obedience to the Law. God promised life if they could obey, and the *Iewes*, as their duty was promised they would obey; but God knew well enough they were neuer able to keepe thier promise, & *ergo* 'twas not Gods intention in this legall *couenant* with the *Iewes*, that any of them should euer attaine *Iustification*, and life by that meanes. as at first the *Promise* need not to haue beene made vnto *Adam*, if the Law could haue suffised for the attaining of life: so after the promise was once made, the Law was not renewed with the *Iewes* to that end that *Righteousnesse* and *life* should bee had by the obseruation of it. This is the plaine doctrine of the *Apostle Gall.*3. in that his excellent dispute against *Iustification* by the Law. The doubt that troubled the *Gallathians* was this. God had made an *Euangelicall couenant* with *Abraham* [a] that in *Christ* he and his faithfull seed should be blessed; that is, *Iustified*. Afterward 430 yeares hee made a *legall couenant* with *Abrahams posterity*, that they should liue, that is, be *iustified* & saued, if they did fulfill all things written in the Law. The *Question* now was, which of these two *couenants* should stand in force, or whether both could stand together. The *Apostle* answeres, that the former couenant should stand in force, and that the later did not abrogate the former;

a verse 8.

mer; nor yet could stand in force together with the former. This he expresseth v. 17. 18. *And this I say, that the couenant that was confirmed afore of God in respect of Christ, the law which was* 430 *yeares after, cannot disanull that it should make the Promise of none effect. For if the inheritance (viz.) of righteousnesse & life be by the law; it is not by the promise: but God gaue it to Abraham by promise,* here now they might obiect, *wherefore then serueth the law?* If men cannot bee *iustified* by keeping the Law, to what end was it giuen so long after the *Promise* was made? To this the *Apostle* answeres. *It was added (vnto the promise) because of transgressions.* Her's the true vse of the *Morall* law, since the fall of *Man,* not to iustifie him and giue life: but to proue him to be vniust and worthy of death. It was added [*because of transgressions*] that is. 1. To conuince man of *sinne,* that he might be put in remembrance what was his duty of old; & what was his present infirmity in doeing of it, and what was Gods wrath against him for not doeing it. That seeing how impossible it was for him to attaine vnto life by this old way of the Law, first appointed in *Paradise,* he might be humbled and driuen to looke after that new way, which God had since that time layed forth, more heedfully attending the *Promise,* and seeking vnto *Christ,* who is the end of the Law vnto euery one that beleeues in him. Which vse God pointed out vnto the Iewes, figuring *Christ* vnto them in the *Mercy seate,* couering the *Arke* wherein the tables of the couenant were kept, and in the *Sacrifices* appointed for all sorts of *Transgressions* against this *Couenant.* To admonish the Iewes a further thing was aimed at in giuing them the Law, namely the bringing of them----- to *Christ* the *promised seed,* in whom remission of sinnes, and Life eternall was to be had. 2. To restraine *Man* from *Sinne.*

That the Law might be a perpetuall rule of Holineſſe and Obedience whereby man ſhould walke and glorifie God to the vtmoſt of his power. That ſo thoſe *Iewes* might not thinke that God by making a gratious *Promiſe*, had vtterly nullified the Law, and that now men might liue as they liſt; but that they might know theſe bounds preſcribed them of God, within which compaſſe they were to keepe themſelues, that ſo the ouerflowing of *iniquity* might bee reſtrained. Theſe moſt excellent, perpetuall and neceſſary vſes of the morall law, God intended in renewing of the *Legall conenant* with the *Iewes*: and *ergo* the *Apoſtle* concludes, that God did not croſſe himſelfe, when firſt he gaue the *inheritance* to *Abraham* by promiſe, & afterwards made a *Legall couenant* with the *Iewes* his poſterity. *Is the law then againſt the promiſes* (ſaith the *Apoſtle*) *God forbid. For if there had beene a Law giuen, which could haue giuen life, ſurely righteouſneſſe ſhould haue bin by the law: But the Scripture hath concluded all vnder ſinne, that the promiſe by the faith of Ieſus Christ might bee giuen to all that beleiue.* verſe 21.22. Whence it is moſt cleare that the Law and the Goſpell in ſome things are ſubordinate and vphold one another; in other abſolute, and deſtroy one another: As the Law by the diſcouery of ſinne and the puniſhment of it, humbles man & prepares him to receiue the *Goſpell*. 2 As the law is a ſacred direction for *Holineſſe* and *Obedience* to thoſe that haue embraced the *Goſpell* and all others. 3 As the Law requires *ſatisfaction* for the breach of it, and the *Goſpell promiſeth* ſuch *ſatisfaction*: this the *law* and *Goſpell* agree well together and eſtabliſh one another. But as the Law giues life to them that perfectly obey it, and the *Goſpell* giues life to them that ſtedfaſtly beleiue it: thus the law and *Goſpell* are one againſt the other, & ouerthrow one another. And *ergo*

if

if God had giuen such a *Law* to the *Iewes*, as could haue brought *Saluation* to them through the perfect fulfilling of it: 'tis apparent that God had made voide his former couenant vnto *Abraham*, because *Righteousnesse* should haue bin by the law and not by *Christ*. But now God gaue no such Law, as could bee kept by the *Iewes*, as the *Apostle* proues, because all were *sinners* against it; and therefore it followes that notwithstanding the giuing of the Law, the *Promise* standes good for euer; and *Righteousnesse* is to bee obtained onely by the *Faith* of *Iesus Christ*.

From hence wee conclude firmely. That the difference betweene the Law and the *Gospell*, assigned by our *Diuines* is most certaine and agreeable to the *Scriptures*. viz. That. *The law giues life vnto the iust vpon condition of perfect Obedience in all things: The Gospell giues life vnto sinners vpon condition, they repent & beleiue in Christ Iesus.* Whence it is plaine. That in the point of *iustification* these two are *incompatible*, & that therefore our *minor proposition* standes verified. *That iustification by the workes of the law, makes voide the couenant of Grace.* Which *Proposition* is the same with the *Apostles* assertion elsewhere. *Gal.* 2.21. *If righteousnesse be by the Law Christ died in vaine.* and *Gal.*5.4. *Ye are abolished from Christ: whosoeuer are iustified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.*

By so much more iniurious are these of the *Romish Church* vnto the *Gospell* of *Christ*, when by denying this difference, they would confound the Law and *Gospell*: and bring vs backe from *Christ* to *Moses*, to seeke for our *Iustification* in the fulfilling of the *Morall law*. They would perswade vs that the *Gospell* is nothing, but a more perfect law, or the law perfect by addition of the *Spirit*, enabling men to fulfill it; That the promises of the *Gospell* bee vpon this

condition, of fulfilling the law, with such like stuffe. Their Doctrine touching this point is declared vnto vs by *Bellarmine.lib.*4.*de iustificat.*cap.3.4. Where he coines many distinctions betweene the Law & *Gospell*: but will by no meanes admit of that which our *Reformed Diuines* make to bee the chiefe. The chiefe distinction which he conceaues to be betweene them he framed thus, *The Gospell* (saith he) *is taken in a double sense.* 1. *For the Doctrine of Christ, and his Apostles by them preached and written*; 2. *For the grace of the Holy Ghost giuen in the new testament, which he makes to be the Law written in our hearts, the quickening spirit, the law of faith, charity shed abroad in our hearts, in opposition to the Law written in stone, to the dead and killing Letter, the Law of Workes, the spirit of bondage and feare.* Vpon this hee proceeds to the difference betweene the Law and the Gospell. Thus. *The law teacheth vs what is to be done, the Gospell (if it be taken for the grace of the holy Ghost) so it differs from the Law; because it giues strength to doe it: but if it be taken for the Doctrine deliuered by Christ and his Apostles, so it agrees with the law, teaching vs, as the law doth, what things are to be done.* This argument the *Iesuite* illustrates and proues in three particulars.

2 Cor.3.

John.1.17.

1 *The Gospell containes, Doctrinam operum, or leges. For Morall præcepts, they be the same in the Gospell, that be in the law; euen those precepts that seeme most euangelicall.* (viz.) *of louing our enimies, witnesse of this all the writings of the new Testament, wherein euery where wee finde præcepts and exhortations to the same vertues, Prohibitions and dehortations from the same vices which the law forbids or commands. So that for Moralls, the Doctrine of the Gospell is but the Doctrine of the law; newly* (that is) *most cleerely and fully*

Exod. 20.

ly expounded. Nor is the Gospell more perfect in substance: but in circumstance a more perspicuous Doctrine.

Which though a truth, yet is very ridiculously proued by the *Cardinall* out of *Mat.*5.*Nisi abundauerit &c. Vnlesse your righteousnesse exceed. What?* Hee saieth not the righteousnesse of the law and *Prophets*: but of the *Scribes & Pharisees; yee shall not enter* &c. A profound *Glosse.* (Christ would not adde to the burden of the law: but to take away from the false *glosse* of the Scribes & Pharisees.) Surely good cause had our Sauiour to taxe both the Doctrine of the Pharisees in interpreting, and their manners in their hypocriticall practise of the law in outward matters; without inward obedience: But little reason was there that Christ should require of man more perfection then Gods Law required, & 'tis a fancy to dreame of any such meaning, in our Sauiours speech.

2 *The Gospell containes Comminations, and threatnings as the Law doth Witnesse the many woes from Christs owne mouth against the Scribes and Pharisees; together with those frequent denunciations of iudgement and Damnation to such as are vngodly, that doe not repent and obey the Gospell.*

3 *Thirdly the Gospell containes promises of Life and happinesse: but these Euangelicall promises be not absolute but vpon the same condition, that the legall are.* (viz.) *Cum conditione implendæ legis, Cum conditione Iustitiæ actualis, & operosæ, quæ in perfecta Mandatorum obseruatione consistit.* Cap.2.

This the *Iesuite* will proue vnto vs.

1 From that *Mat.*5.*Vnlesse your righteousnesse abound* &c. (that is, in *Bellarmines* Construction) so farre as, *vnto the perfect keeping of the Law: you shall not enter into*

into the Kingdome of Heauen.

2 From *Mat.*19.17. *Mark.*10.19. Where Christ speaks to the young man, asking him what hee should doe to be saued: *If thou wilt enter into life keepe the commandements.* And to the Lawyer. (*Luke* 10.28.) who asked the like Question he answeres. *This doe and thou shalt liue.* That is. *Fulfill the law and thou shalt be saued.* In which words they say, *That Christ did preach the Gospell, and shewed vnto these men the very Euangelicall way to saluation.*

3 From the many places of Scripture. Wherein *Mortification of Sinne, and the studious practise of Holines, & Obedience is required of vs.* As. *Rom.* 8. *If yee mortifie the deeds of the flesh by the spirit, ye shall liue.* So *Ezekiel* 18. 21. *If the wicked will returne from all his Sinnes, that he hath committed, and keepe all my Statutes, and doe that which is lawfull and Right: hee shall surely liue and not die.* With a number such like places.

Iohn.13.17. If ye know those things, &c. Iohn.15.14. Ye are my friends If ye doe whatsoeuer I command you.

4 From the very tenor of the Gospell. *He that beleiueth shall be saued: but hee that beleiueth not, shall bee damned.* Where wee see the promise of *life* is not absolute, but conditionall. *If wee doe such and such workes.*

From hence the Romanist concludes: That seeing the *precepts, threatnings,* and *promises* of the *Gospell,* bee for matter the same, that those of the law are: the true difference betweene the law and Gospell shall bee this. *That the law nakedly propoſeth what is to be done without giuing grace to performe it: but the Gospell not only propoſeth what is to be done, but withall giueth grace and strength to doe it: and therefore the law giuen by Moses the law-*

giuer

giuer cannot iustifie, because it was giuen without the grace of fulfilling it: but the Gospell giuen by Christ the Redeemer doth iustifie, because it is accompanied with the grace of the holy Ghost, making vs able to keepe the law. For which cause also the law of Moses is a yoake vnsupportable, the law of [a] *feare and bondage; because it giues not grace to keepe it, but onely conuinceth our sinne, and threatens vs punishment: but the Law of Christ, the Gospell is a light yoake, a law of loue and liberty; because it giues grace to keepe it, and of loue to God and man: and so by fulfilling frees a man from feared punishment.*

a Rom.8.15. Gall.4.24.25.

This is the summe of the Romish Doctrine touching the difference betwixt the morall law and the Gospell in the point of iustification, as it is deliuered vs by Bellarmine, *the rotten pillar of the Antichristian Synagogue.* Wherein we haue scarce a syllable of distinct truth: but all perverted by equiuocations and grosse ambiguities, as shall appeare by a short suruey of the former discourse. Whereas then he distinguisheth the Gospell into the doctrine of Christ, & his Apostles, and into the grace of the holy Ghost: let vs follow him in these two parts.

First for doctrine. Wee grant that the Gospell is often so taken: but in this matter about iustification, this acception is too large, and not distinct enough. For although, by a *Synecdoche* of the chiefest and most excellent part, the whole doctrine and ministery of Christ and his Apostles with their successours, be called the doctrine of the Gospell, and [b] the ministery of the Gospell: yet all things which they preached or wrote, is not the Gospell properly so called. But as *Moses* chiefly deliuered the law vnto the *Iewes*, though yet with all he wrote of Christ, and so in part reuealed

b Rom.12.16. At that day when God shal iudge the secrets of men by Iesus Christ according to my Gospell.

led vnto them the Gospell: so Christ and his Ministers, though chiefly they preach the Gospell, yet in its place they vrge the law withall, as that which hath its singular vse in furthering our Christian faith and practise. Wherefore when we speake of the Gospell as opposite to the Law, 'tis a *Iesuiticall equiuocation* to take it in this large sense. For the whole doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, preached by them, and written for vs in the Booke of the new *Testament*, we follow the Apostle in his dispute of iustification, *Gal.* 3. 4. 5. And according as he doth take the Gospell strictly for the promise of iustification & life made vnto man in Christ Iesus. This is in proper termes the Gospell (*viz.*) that speciall doctrine touching mans redemption and reconciliation with God by the meanes of Iesus Christ; the Revelation whereof was indeed [εὐαγγέλιον] the gladdest tidings that were ever brought to the eare of mortall man. Which Gospell in strict termes the Angells preached, *Luc.* 2. 10. 11. *Behold I bring you glad tidings of great ioy, which shall be to all people. That vnto you is borne this day in the Citty of Dauid, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord.* And afterward Christ and his Apostles fully explained the mysteries thereof vnto the world. According to this necessary distinction, wee answere. That if wee take the Gospell in that large acception, tis true which *Bellarmine* hath. That the Gospell containes in it the Doctrine of workes (*viz.*) the Morall law, even the very same precepts, prohibitions, threatnings, and promises which are deliuered in the law. All which as Christ and his Apostles preached: so may all Ministers without blame, yea, they must, if they will avoid blame, presse the same vpon their hearers, seasonably and discreetly, that the law may make way for the better receauing and entertainment of Grace in the Gospell. But hence it followes not, that the Gospell

Gospell properly so taken, is to be confounded as one and the same thing with the Law; because the law is conioyned with it in the preachings and writings of the Ministers of the New *Testament*. They still are diuided in their nature & offices: nor hath the Gospell any affinity with the Law in precepts, threatnings, or promises. Wherefore when *Bellarmine* teacheth vs. That *Euangelicall promises bee made with condition of perfect fulfilling the Law*. Tis a desperate errour, and that in the very foundation. You heard his proofes before recited: see now a little how passing weake they be.

1 *Mat.5. Except your righteousnesse, &c.* To this wee answere. The plaine meaning of the place is this. Our righteousnesse must abound more then that of the *Pharisees* (that is) It must not be outside only as theirs was: but inward righteousnesse of the heart, in inward sanctity of the thoughts and affections, as well as of the outward action: or else such our hypocrisie will keepe vs from entring into heaven. But doth it hence follow, that because wee must bee more perfect then these *Pharisees*, we must bee as perfect in all things as the law requires: we must exceed them, *Ergo*, equall the holinesse of the law in all points? Because wee must be syncere without hypocrisie, *ergo*, we must be perfect in all things without blame? Such consequents as these, the *Iesuite* hath concluded out of his owne head, not out of the Text. 1

Touching that speech of Christ to the young man. *Mat.* 19. and the Lawyer, *Luk.* 10. That if they did fulfill the law, they should liue. We answere, that Christ in so speaking vnto them did not preach the Gospell: but shewed vnto them the legall way to saluation. For these erring that grand error of the Iew in seeking for righteousnesse not by faith 2

but by the workes of the law, seuering the law, from Christ the end thereof, (as the Apostle shewes *Rom.*9.31.32.& 10. 3.and so supposing to bee saued by doing some good thing. Christ answers them in their humour, as euery one shou'd be answered, that swells with high conceits of his own righteousnesse and workes, that there was a law to be kept: and if they could fully obserue the righteousnesse of it, they should be saued, sending them of purpose to the law, that they might be humbled thereby and see their great folly in seeking for life by that, which they were so vnable to keepe. Against which answer the *Iesuite* hath nothing to reply; but stands much in confuting of another answere made by some of our Diuines. That Christ *spake these things ironically*. This *Bellarmine* seekes to confute; nor doe I labour to confirme it; though it might be iustified for any thing he brings to the contrary.

Calu. inst. lib.3. cap.18.§.9.

3 Vnto those places of Scripture that euery where almost promise life, blessednesse, the fauour of God, vpon condition of [*holinesse in life and conuersation, that we mortifie the lusts of the flesh, walke in the spirit, ouercome the world &c.*] We answere, that, *Obedience is one thing, perfect obedience is another*. We say that the *promises of the Gospell* be all vpon condition of *obedience*: but none vpon condition of *perfect obedience*. Tis an iniury done vnto vs, when they say; we teach that *Euangelicall promises* be absolute & without condition, as if God did promise and giue all vnto vs; & we doe nothing for it on our parts. We defend no such dotage. The promises of the Gospell bee *conditionall (viz.)* Namely vpon condition of *repentance* and *amendment of life*. That we study to our power to obey God in all things; but this is such a condition as requires of vs *sincerity* and *faithfulnesse* of endeauour, not *perfection* of obedience in the

3

the full performance of euery iot and tittle of the law.

Vnto the last argument, from the tenour of the *New Covenant (viz.)* That we must beleeue if we will be saued; *ergo*, the *promise* of the Gospell is with condition of fulfilling the law. This is an *Argument* might make the Cardinalls cheeke as red as his cap, were there any shame in him. Faith indeed is a worke: and this worke is required as a *condition* of the *promise*: but to doe this worke, *To beleeue*, though it be to obey Gods commandement; yet it is not perfectly to fulfill the whole law; but *perfectly* to trust in him, who brings mercy and pardon for transgressions of the law.

CHAP. II.

Of Bellarmines erronious distinction of the word Gospell.

SO much of the first member of the *Iesuites* distinction, wherein his sophisticall fraud appeares, taking the Gospell for the whole doctrine of the *New Testament*, published by Christ and his Apostles, and *ergo*, confounding the law and the Gospell as one: because he findes the law as well as the Gospell deliuered vnto vs, by our Sauiour and his Ministers: I proceed to the second branch of it. *The Gospell* (saith he) *is taken for the grace of the Holy Ghost giuen vs in the New Testament: whereby men are made able to keepe the law.* Tis so taken. But where is it so taken? The *Iesuite* cannot tell you that: [*Vt verum fatear* (saith he) *nomen Euangelij non videtur in Scripturis vspiam accipi, nisi pro doctrina.*] No good reason for it, in as much as tis evident to all men, that there is great difference betweene the doctrine of Mans *saluation* by the mercy of God through the *Merits* of Christ (which is properly

perly the Gospell) and the graces of the holy Ghost bestowed on man in his *Regeneration*, whereby he is made able in some measure, to doe that which is good. But the fault is not so much in the name in calling the grace of God in vs by the name of Gospell: as in the misinterpretation of the matter it selfe. Wherein two errours are committed by the *Iesuite*.

1 In that he maketh the *grace* of the New Testament, to be such strength giuen to man: that thereby hee may fulfill the Law.

2 In that he saith. The Law was giuen without *grace* to keepe it. In both which assertions there is ambiguity and Errour.

For the first. We grant that grace to doe any thing that is good, is giuen by the Gospell, not by the Law. The Law commands: but it giues no strength to obey, because it presupposeth that he, to whom the command is giuen, hath, or ought to haue already in himselfe strength to obey it. And *Ergo*, we confesse it freely, that we [*receiue the spirit not by the workes of the law: but by the hearing of faith preached*] as it is *Gal.*3.2. The donation of the Spirit in any measure whatsoeuer of his *sanctifying graces* is from *Christ as a Sauiour*, not as a *Lawgiuer*. Thus then we agree. That all grace to doe well is giuen vnto vs by the *Gospell*; but next we differ. They teach that the Gospell giues such grace vnto man, that he may fulfill what the law commands: and so bee iustified by it. we deny it, and say that *Grace* is giuen by the *Gospell*, to obey the law sincerely without hypocrisie: but not to fulfill it perfectly without *infirmities*. In which point the *Iesuite* failes in his proofes which he brings.

1 Out of those places where contrary attributes are ascribed to the law and gospell. Vnto the law. That it is [*the ministry*

ministry [a] *of death and condemnation*] [*Killing* [b] *letter*] that it [*worketh wrath*] that it is a [*Yoake* [d] *of bondage*] a [*Testament* [e] *bringing forth children vnto bondage.*] But vnto the gospell, that it is *The ministry* [f] *of life*] and [*of Reconciliation*] [g] the [h] [*spirit that quickneth*] the [*Testament that bringeth forth children to liberty*] which opposition *Bellarmine* will haue to bee, because the *law giues precepts without affording strength to keepe them: but the gospell giues grace to doe what is commanded.* But the *Iesuite* is here mistaken. These opposite attributes giuen to the law, are ascribed to it in a *twofold respect*, 1 In regard of the punishment which the law threatens to offenders (*viz.*) *Death.* In which regard principally the law is said to bee the *ministry of death, to work wrath*, to be not a *dead, but a killing letter*: in as much as being broken it leaues no hope to the *Transgressour*: but a fearefull expectation of *eternall death & condemnation* of the *law* vnder the terrors whereof it holdes them in bondage. But on the *Contrary the gospell* is the ministery of life, of *reconciliation of the quickning spirit* and of *liberty*, because it reveales vnto vs *Christ* in whom we are restored to life; from the deserued death and condemnation of the law, vnto Gods fauour, being deliuered from the wrath to come, vnto liberty; being freed from *slauish feare of punishment.* This is the chiefe reason of this *opposition* of *Attributes.* Secondly the next is in regard of obedience. In which respect the *ministry* of the Law is said to be the *Ministery* of the Letter written in *tables of Stone*: but that of the Gospell is called the *ministery* of the spirit which writes the law in the *fleshly tables* of the heart. Because the law barely commands: but Ministers not power to obey; and so is but as a dead letter without the Vertue of the spirit. But in the Gospell grace is giuen from *Christ*, who by the *Holy Ghost* sanctifieth

a 2.Cor.3.7.
b 2.Cor.3.6.
c Rom.4.15. 1.Cor. 15.56.
d Gal 5.1.
e Gal.4.24.
f 2.Cor.3.6.
g 2.Cor.5,19.
h 2.Cor. 3.6. 7.17. Gal.4.26.

ctifieth the heart of his elect, that they may liue to *Righteousnesse* in a sincere thought not euery way exact conformity to the law of God. The like answere wee giue vnto another proofe of his.

2 Out of that place (*Iohn* 1.17. *The law came by Moses: but grace and truth by Iesus Christ.*) that is (saith *Bellarmine*) *The law came by Moses without grace to fulfill it: but grace to keepe it, by Christ.*

We answere. The true interpretation of these words is this: *Moses* deliuered a twofold law, *Morall* & *Ceremoniall*. Opposite to these *Christ* hath brought a twofold *priuiledge*. Grace for the *morall law*, whereby we vnderstand not onely power giuen to the *regenerate* in part to obserue this Law, which strength could not come by the Law it selfe: but also, much more *Remission of sinnes* committed against the law, and so our iustification and freedome from the guilt of sinne and curse of the *Morall law*. Secondly, truth for the *Ceremoniall law* the substance being brought in & the shadows vanished. Wherefore the *Iesuite* erres greatly in this point, when he makes the grace of the *New Testament* to consist in this. That strength is thereby giuen vs to fulfill the Law. The grace of God in the Gospell is chiefly our *Iustification* and redemption from the curse of the Law: and in the next place strength afforded vs to obey the law in some measure not *perfectly* as our aduersaries would haue it. In the next point he erres as much in saying that the Law of *Moses* was giuen without grace to obey it. A false assertion. For although the law of it selfe giue not grace: yet tis certaine that grace was giuen by Christ euen then when *Moses* published the law. Sufficient for the proofe hereof are. 1 These excellent properties ascribed vnto the law of God, as in other places of the *Old Testament:* so specially in the booke of the

Psalmes

Psalmes. And amongst thē in the 19.& 119. *Ps.* where the law of God is said to *(giue light to the eyes, to conuert the soule, to reioice the Heart &c.)* which it could not doe of it selfe, had not the *grace* of the *Holy Ghost* beene giuen in these times. Without which the Law could worke no such sauing effects. 2 Experience of those times in the faith *Patience and obedience*, and all sorts of *graces* shining in those auncient Saints, who liued before & after the law was giuen. Which *graces* they receiued from the *Holy Ghost*, shed vpon their hearts by vertue of *Christ* mediation, whereby they receiued strength to liue holily in obedience vnto the law of God. The difference betweene these times, and those vnder the law, is not, that wee haue grace and they had none: but only in the measure & extent of the same grace bestowed, both on vs and them. In those times as the Doctrine of the gospell was more obscurely reuealed: so the grace which accompanies it was more sparingly distributed, being confined to a Church collected of one nation, and bestowed vpon that Church in a lesser measure, thē now; though yet sufficiently in that measure. But in the times of the new Testament, the light shines more brightly, and grace is dispenced more liberally, being extended indifferently to all Nations and poured vpon the Godly in a larger abundance: according as was promised *Ieremiah.* 31. Though also this comparison must be restrained vnto whole Churches, what generlly is now done; for no doubt in many particulars some men vnder the law exceede for abundance of grace, many vnder the Gospell. Wherefore it is a notable iniury vnto the Bounty of God, and the honour of those Saints of old, to exclude them from partaking of the Gospell; to affirme that they were led only by the *Spirit* of Feare, and not of loue; that they receiued not the *Spirit* of adoption to cry *Abba* father

Thou art our Father ᵇ See *Becanus Tom.2. Tract.4 cap.5. Quest.1.2.3.*

father as well as wee though not plentifully as wee; and ſo [b] that they were not ſonnes though vnder *Tutors* and *gouernors*, as wee confeſſe they were but very ſeruants held in Bondage and excluded from the inheritance of grace, & glory till after *Chriſts* Death. So that at beſt their adoption was but *conditionall* with regard of time to come: but, for the preſent, they were handled as ſlaues fear'd with *temporall puniſhments* allured by *temporall rewards*, like a heard of ſwine fed with baſe *acornes and huskes*. Theſe bee abſurd errors bred out of Scripture miſvnderſtood. Eſpecially that of *Iohn*: 1. *Grace came by Chriſt. Ergo, not before Chriſts Incarnation.* A ſilly Argument. *Chriſt* is as old as the *world*, and his grace as ancient as the name of man vpon earth. Grace alwaies came by *Chriſt*, and was in its meaſure giuen by him long before he appear'd in the fleſh. Hee was euer the head of his Church, and that his body, which he alwaies quickned by the bleſſed influence of his ſpirit miniſtred therevnto. Whereby the *Godly* before as well as ſince his *incarnation* were made liuing members of that his *myſticall Body*. Wherefore it is apparant, that grace is not to be tied to the times of the *Goſpell* and ſeuered from the Law. Nay, as of old the Law was not alwaies without *grace*: ſo now many times the *Goſpell* it ſelfe is without *grace Chriſt* himſelfe being *a ſtumbling ſtone and rocke of offence, the Goſpell a ſauour of death* to many of thoſe, vpon whom *Grace* is not beſtowed; to beleeue and embrace it.

I conclude then. That this difference, which our aduerſaries make betweene the Law and *Goſpell* is falſe: and that their error is pernitious in making the *Goſpell* to be nothing, but the ſpirit added to the Law that man may fulfill it to his Iuſtification. That thus a man may bee ſaued by *Chriſt* through the perfect fulfilling of the law. Which is a monſtrous

strous and vncouth Doctrine laying an vnsuportable burthen vpon the conscience of man and hazarding his soule to *eternall* destruction: whiles by this meanes hee frustrates the Grace of God in Christ; and withall frustrates his owne hopes of life expecting to obtaine it by that Law which hee is neuer able to fulfill.

SECT. 5. CHAP. 1.

Iustification by fulfilling the law, ouerthrowes Christian liberty, the parts of our Christian liberty.

SO much of the third argument: The last followes drawne from the Nature of *Christian liberty*. Which is this.

4. Arg. *That which ouerthrowes our Christian liberty purchased for vs by the death of Christ: thats no Euangelicall, but an Hæreticall Doctrine.* 4. Argument.

But iustification by the workes of the law ouerthrowes the spirituall liberty of man obtained for him by Christ.

Ergò. *'Tis an hæresie against the Gospell.*

For the proofe of the *minor proposition*, let vs in briefe consider wherein stands that Liberty wherewith Christ hath made vs free, that so we may the better perceiue what part thereof, this doctrine of iustification by workes doth nullifie and depriue vs of. The liberty wee haue in *Christ* is either in regard of the *Life to come*, or of *this present life*. The first is the *liberty* of *Glory* consisting in *a full deliuerance from the state of vanity & misery, both sinfull & painefull, whereunto we are now subiect.* And not wee only, but the whole *Creation*, which with vs συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει *groaneth and trauaileth in paine*, till with vs it also be *deliuered*, ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας

ἐλευθερίας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ; *From the bondage of corruption, into the Glorious liberty of the sonnes of God,*) as the *Apostle* declares *Rom.*8.19. *&seq.* This liberty we haue in hope, not in possession. The next we actually inioy in this life, and that is the *liberty of grace.* This we may diuide not vnfitly into three branches: 1 *Freedome from sinne:* 2 *Freedome from the Law:* 3 *Freedome from Men.*

1 Our *Freedome from sinne* stands in 2 things; 1 *In our deliuerance from the Punishment of Sinne.* For whereas euery sinne in its owne nature brings with it guiltines, and a sure obligatiō vnto punishment, binding ouer the transgressour vnto the paines of Gods eternall wrath by a stronger chaine then of steele or Adamant: *Christ* by his meritorious *satisfaction* hath broken these bonds, and ransomed vs from this fearefull bondage vnto Hell and destruction. *He being made a curse for vs, hath redeemed vs from the curse of the law. Gal.*3.13. That is, By taking on himselfe the punishment of our sinnes in his owne person suffering, and satisfying the wrath and iustice of God, he hath once for euer set vs free from the dreadfull vengeance of God, which wee deserue should fall vpon vs for our iniquities.

2 In our deliuerance from the power of sinne, which though it abide in vs in the reliques of our corrupted nature: yet by the power of the *Holy Ghost* dwelling in the *Hearts* of the *Regenerate*, it is subdued and kept vnder, that it doth not reigne nor exercise i'ts commanding authority without controle. So that whereas the *Vnregenerate* be the Seruants of Sinne, wholly at the command of *Satan* and wicked affections, the *Regenerate* are freed from this *slauery* being ruled and guided by the *Spirit* of the Lord, which whereseoeuer it is, there is liberty, as the *Apostle* speakes, 2. *Cor.*

*Cor.*3.17. Liberty from that blindnesse whererein wee are holden by Nature, not knowing what the will of God is. Liberty from that rebellion and infirmity of our nature, whereby wee are, nor willing, nor able to doe the will of God. From which we are freeed in part by the *Spirit* of *Christ*, inlightning our mindes, and changing our hearts. This Liberty from sinnes dominion and damnation, St *Paul* ioynes together, *Rom.*8.2. (*The law of the spirit of life, which is in Christ Iesus, hath freed me from the law of sinne and of Death.*) And againe. Rom.6.14. *Sinne shall not haue dominion ouer you, for ye are not vnder the law, but vnder grace.*

2 *Our freedome from the law is either from the* { *Ceremoniall* / *or* / *Morall law.*

The *Ceremoniall law* contained in it diuerse *Carnall Ordinances* (*δικαιώματα σαρκὸς*) to endure vntill the time of reformation. From all which *Christ* hath freed the *Church* of the *New Testament*, as namely. Heb.9.10.

1 From the whole burthen of Legall *ceremonies* whatsoeuer vsed in the worship of God. Those resemblances are of no vse now, when the *substance* it selfe is come in place: nor may such *beggarly and impotent rudiments* be sought after, when greater *perfection* is to be had *Gal.*4.9.

2. From that *restraint* in things indifferent, wherevnto the *Iewes* were tied: but wee are not bound. Such are the obseruations of dayes, of meates & drinkes, of garments, with the like. Wherein the *Iewes* were restrained: but our consciences are left free, being taught that *euery creature of God is good being sanctified by prayer and thanksgiuing.* 1. *Tim.* 4.4.5. And that to the [b] *pure all things are pure.* Only this being obserued, that wee abuse not this our Liberty, but that as wee are informed by faith that all things are lawfull b 1 Tit.1.15.

for vs: so wee should be taught by *charity* to see what are expedient in regard of others. That a due regard be had of others infirmity, that nothing bee done whereby the truly weake *may be scandalized*, as the *Apostle* commands, *Rom.* 14. 21. By which meanes *knowledge* on the one side still preserues vs, that our *consciences* be not insnared with *superstion*, & *charity* on the other side shall keepe our Liberty from degenerating into licentiousnesse, & *vnchristian* contempt of our weake brethren.

1 Cor. 10. 23.

2 Our freedome from the *Morall law* stands in this, that whereas the law requires of euery man, vpon strictest termes of *Necessity*, full and compleate obedience to all things whatsoeuer contained in it, if he will auoide the *punishment* of Hell fire: *Christ* hath freed all that beleiue in him from this heauy and rigorous exaction of the law, taking away from our consciences this obligation vnto a necessary fulfilling thereof, vpon paine that wee shall forfeit *Heauen* if wee doe it not. As we shall see more anon.

This liberty from humane constitutions binding the Conscience, is properly not a benefit purchased for vs by Christs death: but it is an intire priuiledge of our creation, whereby our Consciences are exempt from mens command, & onely subiect to Gods iurisdiction. Yet because this Liberty is a part of our spirituall Liberty, it is vsually called Christian Liberty.

3 In the last place our freedome is from men: namely from all power & authority they may claime ouer our *consciences:* they may hold our persons in subiection, but them cannot command ouer our *consciences*. Wee acknowledge no Iurisdiction of man or Angell ouer our Consciences; but only that of God that created vs, and of Christ that hath redeemed vs. Whosoeuer *ergo* shall impose vpon man any *humane traditions*, *opinions*, or *Ordinations* whatsoeuer to tie his *conscience* vnto obedience by vertue of his own *authority*, such a one trenches vpon Gods high *Prærogatiue*, and vsurpes *tyrannically* ouer the *soules* of *men*, according, as at this day that *Man* of *Sinne* doth. But here we must obserue that humane constitutions be either *Ecclesiasticall* or *Politicall Ecclesiasticall* concerne either the *matter* and *substance* of

of Gods worship when any thing is inuented by man, and commanded, wherein and whereby to worship God. 2 The *manner* and *externall order* of Gods worship in the determination of indifferent circumstances tending to *decencie* and *comelinesse*.

For the former wee renounce and reiect all *humane authority* whatsoeuer, that shall without warrant from the Scriptures prescribe vnto the *Church* any doctrine to bee receiued as a diuine Truth or *custome, ceremony* or *practise* whatsoeuer to be obserued as a proper part of Gods most holy worship. According as our *reformed Churches* haue happily recouered their liberty by breaking asunder those cordes, and casting away that yoake of false doctrine of superstitious, *ceremoniall* will-worships, wherewith not Christ, but Anti-Christ had insnared and oppressed the Church. And they haue Gods owne warrant for so doing, *Isay.29.* 13. ratified and explained by *Christ*, *Mat.* 15. 9. (*In vaine they worship me, teaching for doctrine mens precepts*:) which was a thing contrary to Gods expresse commandement. *Ezech.*20. 18.19. (*Walke yee not in the ordinances of your fathers, neither obserue their manners, nor defile your selues with their Idoles: I am the Lord your God walke in my Statutes, and keepe my iudgements and doe them.*)

For the latter, namely *humane Constitutions* concerning indifferent *circumstances* in Gods worship, tending to orderly decency, agreeable to the simplicity and purity of the *Gospell:* herein wee must acknowledge the *authority* of the Church though not ouer our *consciences* to bind them: yet ouer our *Practises* to order and limit them. Accordingly as also we doe in the other branch of *humane obedience.* viz. *Politicall or ciuill,* comprising all law, touching lawfull things made for the gouernance of *Kingdomes*, or *inferior*

states

states by the *supreame Magistrate*, that hath authority so to doe. Wherevnto wee (*must* be *subiect, not because of wrath*
Rom.13.5. *only, but also for conscience sake.*) *For conscience sake*, not because the highest *Monarch* on *Earth* hath power ouer the *conscience* of his meanest subiect; to binde it by vertue of his owne *authority*: but because God hath established the *Magistrates authority* and commanded subiects obedience in lawfull things, & therefore wee cannot disobey them without breach of conscience, in disobeying and violating also Gods *Commandement*. But otherwise for any immediate power the conscience, to restraine the inward liberty thereof, no *man* without *præsumption* may arrogate it, nor any without *slauish basenesse* yeeld to another, as the *Apostle*
1 Cor.7.23. commands (*ye are bought with a price, bee not yee seruants of men.*) This is in briefe the Doctrine of *Christian* or *spirituall liberty*, which wee call *Christian*: 1. from the cause of it, *Christ*, by whose purchase wee enioy it, 2 From the subiect of it, *Christians*, in opposition to the *Iewes*, who had not this liberty in all parts of it as wee haue. Namely in freedome from the *ceremoniall Law*, and restraint in things indifferent. In all other parts they in their measure were freed by *Christ* as well as wee. Againe wee call it *spirituall* in opposition to *ciuill* & bodily Liberty: because it stands in the freedome of soule & *conscience*, not in the freedome of the outward man; the bondage & subiection whereof is no impeachment to this *spirituall* freedome. As *Anabaptisticall Libertines* would perswade the world contrary to the *Apostles* decision. 1. *Cor.* 7.22. (*He that is called in the Lord being a seruant, is the Lords Free-man.*)

CHAP. II.

CHAP. II.

Iustification by workes subiects vs to the rigour and curse of the Law.

WE are now in the next place to see which *branch* of our liberty is cut off by the doctrine of *Iustification* by *workes*. Not to meddle with others whereat it giues a *backblow*, but to take that which it directly strikes at: we say, it destroies our liberty from the morall law, which stands herein, that wee are not obliged vnto the perfect fulfilling of that law, vpon paine of *eternall damnation*, if wee doe it not. This gratious liberty Christ hath enfranchised vs withall, whosoeuer beleeue in him: and they that now teach we are iustified by workes of the law, doe rob our *consciences* of this heauenly freedome, bringing vs againe vnder that miserable bondage vnto the Law, wherein all men are holden, which are in *the state of infidelity and vnregeneration*, from whom the law in extremest rigour exacts perfect obedience if they will be saued.

For the cleering hereof, this in the first place is manifest. That he which will bee iustified by the workes of the Law, is necessarily tied to fulfill the whole Law: seeing 'tis impossible the law should justifie them that transgresse it. In the next place then we must proue, that for a *mans conscience* to be thus tied to the fulfilling of the law for the obtaining of *Iustification*, is an vnsupportable yoake of *spirituall bondage*, contrary to that liberty, wherewith Christ hath made every beleeuer free. This shall appeare in confirming of this *Proposition*.

A man regenerate endued with true faith in Christ Iesus, is not bound in conscience vnto the fulfilling of the whole

law for his Iustification.

This Proposition seemes very strange vnto our aduersaries & to be nothing else but a *ground plot* whereon to build all licentiousnesse and Libertinisme, as if wee did discharge men of all *Allegeance* to God and subiection to his lawes. But their *Calumnies* are not sufficient confutations of *orthodox doctrine:* for the stopping of their mouthes we throwe them this distinction, whereon they may gnaw while they breake their teeth, before they bite it in pecces. Mans conscience stands bound vnto the law of God in a twofold obligation. Either

1 Of *Obedience*, that according to the measure of grace receiued, hee endeauour to the vtmost of his power to liue conformably to the Law of God in all things.

2 Of *fulfilling* the *Law*, that in euery jot and tittle hee obserue all things whatsoeuer it commands vpon paine of *everlasting condemnation* for the least transgression.

We teach that no true beleeuer is freed from the *Obligation* vnto *Obedience*, but so farre as by grace giuen him hee is enabled, he ought to striue to the vtmost, to performe all duties towards God and man commanded in the law, if hee will iustifie his faith to be sound, without *Hypocrisie*. *And ergo, our doctrine is no doctrine of licentiousnesse.* But on the other side wee teach, that euery true beleeuer is freed from that *obligation* vnto the *fulfilling* of the law; for the attaining of life and *iustification* by it. Which *materiall* difference for the clearing of our doctrine not obserued or rather suppressed by [a] *Bellarmine*, causeth the *Iesuite* to labour much in a needlesse dispute, to proue against vs, *That a Christian man is tied to the obseruation of the morall law.* He tells vs *that Christ is a law-giuer aswell as a Redeemer of his Church, præscribing orders for all in common, for each one in particular*

[a] *Lib.4. de Iustif. cap.5.*

particular. That he is a Iudge that sentenceth according to law. That he is a king that ruleth ouer subiects vnto a law. That Christ by his comming did not destroy, but fulfill the law, expounded it and enioyned it to be obserued by vs. That his Apostles vrge it in euery Epistle. That a Christian man sinning offends against the law, and ergo is bound to keepe the law. In all which the Iesuite encounters his owne *phantasie* and not our doctrine which is not wounded by such misguided weapons. For we grant without striuing, *that euery christian is tied to obserue the morall law*, and we auerre that it is a most *vnchristian and Iesuiticall slaunder* to affirme, as he doth, that we teach (*Christianum* [b] *nulli legi obnoxium et subiectum esse in conscientia coram Deo.*) Nay we teach that he is bound to obey to the vtmost of his power: and from this obligation no authority of man or Angell, Pope or Diuell, can discharge him. So much wee grant the arguments alleaged by the *Cardinall* doe enforce, and nothing else. They proue *Obedience* necessary to a beleeuing Christian: but they can neuer proue *perfect fulfilling* of the Law, to be necessarily required of him. From this heauy burthen *Christ* hath eased the shoulders of all such as are in him by a liuely faith, of whom God doth no longer exact perfect *Obedience* to his law in those strict and rigorous termes, that they shall be accursed if they fulfill it not. This we proue by these Scriptures.

[b] Ibidem.

1 *Gal.*5.1.2.3. *(Stand fast* (saith the Apostle) *in the liberty wherein Christ hath made vs free, and be not entangled againe with the yoake of bondage.*] But what is this yoake of bondage? Is it only the obseruation of the ceremoniall law? No. That was indeed part of the yeake which the Apostles sought to lay on the consciences of the *Galatians*. But 'twas the least and the lightest part, the weightiest burthen was

the fulfilling of the *morall law*, where vnto by the doctrine of the false Apostles, the *Galatians* stood obliged. This is plaine by the Text in the words following. [*Behold, I Paul say vnto you that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testifie againe to euery man, which is circumcised, that he is bound to keepe the whole law.*] The Apostles dispute is here euident. The *Galatians* may not be circumcised, nor obserue the *Ceremoniall law*. Why? Because if they did Christ should not profit them at all. But what reason is there for this, that *circumcision* and the *ceremonies* should frustrate the benefit of Christs death? The Apostle alleageth a good reason, because the obseruation of the ceremoniall law, tied them also to the fulfilling of the whole morall law. The Argument is thus framed.

They who are bound to keepe the whole law haue no profit at all by Christ.

But they who are circumcised, are bound to keep the whole law. ergo,

They that be circumcised haue not profit at all in Christ.

The *minor* in this Argument is the expresse words of the Text, and the proofe of it is euident in reason, because the retaining of *Legall ceremonies* did in effect abolish Christ's comming in the flesh, who by his comming in the flesh had abolished them. And *ergo*, they who in reviuing them, denied Christs death, had no meanes at all to be saued: but only by the fulfilling of the *morall law*. Wherevnto they were necessarily bound, if they meant not to perish. Which reason yet is of no force before Christ his comming, and *ergo* then *circumcision* and other *legall ceremonies*, did not lay vpon the *Iewes* such a strict obligation to fulfill the whole law. The *Maior Proposition* is the very reason of the Apostles *Enthymeme*, thus. [*men circumcised are bound to keepe*

keepe the whole law: Ergo, Christ shall not profit them) The reason of the *consequence* is this *Proposition*, [*Whosoeuer are bound to keepe the whole law, Christ profiteth them nothing at all.*] This Argument, and the reason thereof, will hardly passe with approbation in the *Iesuites Schooles*, [*Men are bound to the whole law, ergo, Christ shall not profit them.*] Nay, will they reply: that's a *non sequitur*. For by that doctrine *Christs* death hath cancelled that streight obligation of fulfilling the Law: but euery one that beleeues the promise of saluation in Christ, is yet notwithstanding obliged to fulfill the whole *morall law*. For this is (say they) the very condition whereupon hee must haue benefit by the promise, euen ([a]*Perfecta Mandatorum obseruatio:*) and therefore he is so farre from being freed by Christ from this obligation vnto the Law, that for a certaine, except hee fulfill it, he shall neuer be saued; as [b] *Bellarmine* peremptorily and bloodily determines. These men when they list are wondrous *mercifull* towards *sinners*, and can teach them *trickes* by very easie meanes, to merit heauen and Remission of Sinnes. But their cruelty betraies their kindnesse in other matters; in as much as when all comes to the vpshot, a Sinner is driuen to this. *If he will be saued by Christ, hee must as he is bound, perfectly keep the whole law: else there's no hope for him.* This is cold comfort for the poore beleeuer: but 'tis happy we haue not *Iesuits, Pharaohs taske-masters*, set ouer vs, to exact the whole tale of Bricke: but a *Iesus*, who hath freed our soules from this bitter thraldome and deliuered vs from the power of so rigorous and strict commands of the Law. We beleeue an Apostle of Christ against all the *Sycophants* of *Rome*, and tell them that they giue the *holy Ghost* the lye, when they teach that in beleeuers the obligation to keepe the whole law stands still in full force and vertue not

a Lib.4.cap.2.
b Lib 4.cap.7. (*Si promissio vitæ æternæ est conditionata, ut cap. 1. probauimus, certe necessarium est implere conditionem, si quis saluus fieri velit. Itaque iustus non est liber ab obligatione Legis diuinæ: certo nisi eam impleat non saluabitur.*)

discharged by the death of Christ; directly contrary to this Argument of the Apostle. [*Yee are bound to keep the whole law, ergo, Christ shall not profit you*] Whence we argue thus *Whosoeuer are bound to keepe the whole law, to such Christ is vnprofitable.*

But vnto true beleeuers Christ is not vnprofitable. Ergo, True beleeuers are not bound to keepe the whole law.

A conclusion most certaine, as from these irrefutable *premises:* so from most euident reason. For if such as beleeue in *Christ*, [*Who through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousnesse through faith*] as the Apostle speakes here, vers.5. if such be yet bound to fulfill the whole law for their Iustification, to what end is it to beleieue in Christ, vnto *Righteousnesse* and *Iustification?* If when all is done we must be saued by doing, what profit comes there by belieuing? Can the conscience finde any benefit and comfort at all in Christ, when we shall come to this wofull conclusion; that notwithstanding there is in Scripture much talke of Faith, of Christ, of promises, of grace; yet all this will bring vs no commodity, except this condition be performed on our parts, that we perfectly keepe the law of God: If any thing in the world, this is to impriſon the ſoule in wretchleſſe ſlauerie, and to lay the conſcience vpon the racke of continuall terrors, if Heauen bee not to bee had but vpon ſuch hard termes. And this is moſt apparently to fruſtrate all benefit of Chriſt, of promiſe, of faith, of grace, of *the whole worke of Redemption,* ſeeing in fine, 'tis the law that wee muſt liue by, and not by faith: the perfect fulfilling of the law muſt make vs righteous in God's ſight: and not our beleeuing in Chriſt, that we may be iuſtified. For he that keeps the whole law, is thereby righteous, and by nothing elſe. Here 'tis but a bare ſhift to ſay, though wee bee bound to fulfill the law; yet

If the law ſtill rule ouer vs as ſeruants requiring the preſcribed taske: or elſe ſhaking the Whip, and threatning ſtripes, & not as ouer ſonns commanding obedience.

yet Christ profits vs, because he giues vs grace to performe our bond in exact obedience. This evasion might it stand good, Saint *Paul* were indeed finally confuted as a weake disputant. But the errour of this hath beene touched before, and if nothing else were said, this *Apostolicall argument* is sufficient to refute it. I proceed to other Scriptures.

2 1.*Tim.*1.9.[*Yee knowe that the law is good, if a man vse it lawfully, knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawlesse and disobedient, for the vngodly, for sinners, for vnholy, and prophane, &c.*] The law is not giuen to the righteous. How must this bee vnderstood? Is it not giuen (*quoad directionem*) as a rule prescribed what is to be done, what is not to be done? Yes, wee all agree in that. How is it then not giuen? 'Tis answered, (*quoad coactionem & maledictionem*) as it compels to obedience, and curseth the transgressors. Thus is it not giuen to the iust. This answer is full of ambiguity, and needs some explication, that we may knowe what is the *coaction* or *compelling force* of the law, from which the iust are freed. In vnfolding whereof our aduersaries and wee differ. Whether are in the right, wee shall see by the proposall of both our *Interpretations*. They say, [*The law hath no coactiue or compelling power ouer the iust, because the iust doe obey it, sponte, libenter, & alacriter, & ex instinctu charitatis*] that is, willingly, out of loue: *but it hath a compulsiue force ouer the vniust, because they recalcitrant & cogi quodammodò debent ad obsequium*) that is, they obey vnwillingly, being forced to it by terrors and threatnings, and therefore; *The law rules not ouer the iust, as seruants who obey for feare: but sonnes who obey for loue.*

We expound it otherwise. The law hath not coactiue power ouer the iust, because the iust (that is) true beleeuers in

in Christ Iesus, are freed from the necessity of perfectly fulfilling it, for the obtaining of saluation. But the law hath a coactiue power ouer the vniust and vnbeleeuers, because they are obliged vnto the perfect fulfilling thereof, or else to bee certainely accursed. And *ergo* wee say the law commands ouer the iust as ouer sonnes requiring of them a faithfull and willing endeauour: but it commands ouer the vniust, as ouer *Seruants*, of whom it exacts the vttermost farthing, and vpon the legall default threatens eternall malediction. The difference then betwixt them and vs, is this, They make the coaction of the law to consist in the manner or quality of mans obedience to it. The law compels when men obey vnwillingly. Wee make the coaction of the law to consist in the quality of the command, and condition whereupon obedience is required. The law then compels, when it exacts full obedience vpon penalty precisely threatned to the disobedient. Wherein the truth is manifestly on our side. For 'tis plaine, that compulsion in a Law must be taken in opposition to direction, not persuasion, for lawes perswade not, but command. For if we speak properly a law cannot bee said to compell those, to whom 'tis giuen, as if by any reall and physicall operation it did enforce them to obedience. It proposeth what is to bee done, it setteth before a man, the punishment for disobedience: but it workes not on the will of man, to force it one way, or other. Wherefore if we know what direction in a law is; we shall soone knowe what compulsion is. Direction (as all agree) is the bare prescription, of what is to bee done, or left vndone. Compulsion, that is, the exaction of obedience vpon penalty to be inflicted. What other coactiue force there is in a law, no man can imagine. Well then to apply this. The iust are *sub directione Legis*: but not *sub coactione*. This must

So a King is vnder the Direction: not the compulsion of the law: because not tyed to the Penalty.

must of necessity be vnderstood thus, the iust are not vnder the coactiue power of Gods law, because it doth not exact of them full obedience vpon penalty of eternall death, to be otherwise inflicted on them. As it doth exact of the vniust. For otherwise there will be no differenee betweene the iust and the vniust in regard of this coactiue power of the law, if both the one and the other be obliged to yeeld, alike perfect obedience vpon the like penalty. In this case the Law will be as coactiue to one, as the other, exacting equall obedience, vpon equall termes, both of the iust and vniust. *(viz)* obey fully in all things: or you shall be cursed. The *sonne* and *Seruant* shall be all one, and the Law shall still command ouer the children, with as much terror, as ouer the Bondslaue. There is no difference in the world; in our aduersaries doctrine, both sorts are bound to obey perfectly, or else certainely they shall not be saued. So that the law of it selfe shall be as rigorous towards one as the other. But wee know the scriptures offer vnto vs more mercy: and that *Christ* hath discharged vs from this rigour of the Law, vnder which euery one, that is out of him in the state of vnbeleefe is holden in bondage. As to the difference they make *(the iust obey willingly, the vniust vnwillingly, and ergo the Law compels these and not those)* this is nothing to the purpose. For it alters not the nature of the Law, that it is obeyed with diuerse affections. The Law is the same, for its command and authority; howsoeuer it be obeyed willingly or vnwillingly that matters not. The law ceaseth not to bee coactiue, because 'tis willingly obeyed: euen as a slaue ceaseth not to be vnder the coaction and compelling power of his Master, though he loue his master; and out of a willing minde be content to abide in thraldome. And as *Adam*, though he obeyed the law willingly; yet was vnder the co-

actiue power of it; becauſe he was tyed to obey it, or elſe he ſhould certainely die the death for his tranſgreſſion of it. Wherefore I conclude, that the iuſt are not freed from the Lawes *direction*, nor from the lawes compulſion, as it compels or enioynes them abſolute obedience in all things, and for default therof threatens the vnauoidable malediction of *Gods eternall* wrath.

3 Laſtly for proofe of this point wee haue thoſe places formerly alleadged. *Rom* 6.14. [*Wee are not vnder the law, but vnder grace.*] *Gal.*5.18. [*If wee be led by the ſpirit, wee are not vnder the law*[2,*Cor.*3.17. [*Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the ſpirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.*] *Gal.*3.13. [*Chriſt hath redeemed vs from the curſe of the law, being made a curſe for vs.*] All which, with [b] other the like, doe eſtabliſh this *orthodox doctrine*; *That beleeuers haue obtained freedome by Chriſt, from the rigour of the Morall law, and are not any longer bound in conſcience to the perfect fulfilling thereof vpon this aſſured perill, that if they keepe it not they ſhall not be ſaued.* Wee might ſtand longer vpon each teſtimony: but let that which wee haue ſaid, ſuffice for the vindicating of our *conſcience* from that torture and bondage wherewith theſe *Popiſh Doctors* would enſnare vs. The knowledge of which our liberty, is not to giue vs occaſion of *ſecurity or licentiouſneſſe*, as theſe men calumniate: but to reſtore peace and ſpirituall reſt vnto our *ſoules*; knowing that wee are now deliuered from the neceſſity of obeying, or of periſhing, which before we were in *Chriſt*, lay more heauy vpon our ſoules then a mountaine of lead. That ſo being freed from this thraldome, we might ſerue him who hath freed vs; thankfully, and chearefully, obeying him in all duty, by whom wee haue obtained this glorious *priuiledge*; that whereas perfect obedience was

cum.v.11.

[b] Rom.7.1.2. &c.

ſome

sometimes strictly exacted of vs: now our *sincere*, though *imperfect* indeauours, shall bee mercifully accepted at our hands.

SECT. 6 CHAP. 1.

The reconciliation of that seeming opposition, betweene S. Paul, & S. Iames in this point of Iustification.

THus much of this Argument and of the first Branch of mans *Righteousnesse*, whereby if it were possible he should be iustified. viz. *His Obedience to the law of God.* By which meanes wee haue shewed no flesh shall be iustified in Gods sight. Wee are to proceed vnto the next branch hereof. viz. *Mans satisfaction for his transgression of the law.* Wherein we haue also to proue, that a sinner cannot be acquitted before Gods iudgement seat, by pleading any *satisfaction*, that himselfe can make for his offences. 2 Conclusion.

But in our passing vnto that point wee are to giue you warning of that stumbling stone which *S. Iames*, (as it may seeme) hath layed in our way: least any should dash his faith vpon it; and fall, as our aduersaries haue done into that error of iustification by workes. That blessed *Apostle*, in the second chapter of his Epistle, seemes not only to giue occasion: but directly to teach this doctrine of *Iustification* by workes. For in the 21. ver. &c. He saith expressely, that *Abraham* was iustified by workes when hee offered his sonne *Isaacke* vpon the altar; & also that *Rahab* was in like manner iustified by workes, when she entertained the spies. Whence also he sets downe v. 22. a generall *Conclusion. That a man is iustified by workes and not by faith alone.* Now in shew, no-

thing can be spoken more contrary to St *Paul* his doctrine in his Epistle to the *Romans* and else-where. For in the 4.cap. speaking of the same example of *Abraham*, hee saith cleane contrary, that *Abraham* was not iustified by workes, *for then he might haue boasted ver.*2. And in the 3.*chap.* treating generally of *mans iustification*, by faith; after a strong dispute he draw es forth this *conclusion. That a man is iustified by faith without the workes of the Law v*,28. Which *conclusion* is in appearance *contradictory* to that of S. *Iames*. This harsh discord betweene these *Apostles* seemes vnto some not possible to bee sweetned by any *qualification*, who knowing that the *Holy Ghost* neuer forgets himself e haue concluded that if the spirit of truth speake by S. *Paule*, it was doubtlesse the *spirit* of error, that spake by the author of this Epistle of *Iames*. For this cause most likely it was doubted of in ancient times, as [a] *Eusebius* and *Hierome* witnesse. But yet then also publikely allowed (δεδήμοσι ἐνμένη) in many Churches, and euer since receiued in all: Out of which for the same cause *Luther* and others of his followers, since him would againe throw it forth, accounting the *author* of it to haue built no *gold* and *siluer*; but *straw* and *stubble* vpon the foundation. *Erasmus* assents to *Luther* and *Muscu-lus* agrees with them both, who in his *commentaries* vpon the fourth to the *Romans*, speakes his minde *simply*, that he sees not how *Iames* and *Paul* can agree together, & therefore he turnes out S. *Iames* for the wrangler, supposing that this *Iames* was one of the Disciples of *Iames* the *Apostle*, the brother of *Christ* who vnder pretence of his *Masters* name and authority, continually snarled at the *Apostle Paule*, and opposed his doctrine. Howbeit his epistle got credit in after times, *(cum veritas paulatim inualescente mendacio proculcari caperit.)* That is. When error by degrees preuailed against

[a] Hist. Eccl. 2. cap. 23. Τοιαῦτα μὲν ὁ Ἰάκωβος. οὗ ἡ πρώτη φέρεται ἐπιστολὴ τῶν καθολικῶν εἶναι λέγεται. ἴσμεν δὲ γνησίως ἐν πολλοῖς τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτὴν ἐπιμεμαρτυρημένην καὶ συνήθη μετὰ καὶ ταύτης τῶν ἄλλων τῆς θείας γραφῆς καταλεγομένην. Ὅμως δ' οὖν καὶ ταύτην μὲν τῶν πολλῶν, ἐν ὀλίγοις δεδήμοσι δόμασιν ἐκκλησίας.

gainst the truth. But this medicine is worse then the disease, and is rather violence, then skill, thus to cut the knot where it cannot be readily vntied. A safer and milder course may be holden; and some meanes found out for the according of this grand difference without robbing the *Church* of so much pretious treasure, of diuine knowledge, as is stored vp in this Epistle. Wherefore both they of the *Romish* and wee of the reformed *Churches*, admitting this Epistle for *canonical* doe each of vs search after a fit reconciliation betweene the *Apostles*. But they and wee betweene our selues are irreconcileable in our seuerall reconciliations of them. They reconcile them thus. By distinguishing. 1. of *Iustification*. 2. of *Workes*. *Iustification* (say they) *is of two sorts.*

1 *The first when a man of vniust is made iust and holy, by the Infusion of grace, or the Habit of charity.*

2 *The 2. When a man of iust is made more iust by the augmentation of the Habit of grace first giuen vnto him.*

Againe they diuide workes into two sorts.

1 *Some goe before faith, being performed by the meere strength of nature, & free will without the helpe of grace and such workes as these are not meritorious.*

2 *Some follow faith, being performed by the aide and assistance of grace giuen vnto man: & such workes as these be meritorious.*

These distinctions prepared, the worke is now ready for the sodering, which they finish artificially gleuing together the *propositions* of the two *Apostles* in this sort. *S. Paul* saith that *Abraham, and all men are iustified by faith without workes.* This (say they) *is to be vnderstood of the first iustification, and of workes done before faith, without grace, by the*

strength of nature. So that the meaning of *Paules proposition* (*Abraham & all men, are iustified by faith without workes* is this. *Neither Abraham, nor any other can deserue the Grace of Sanctification, whereby of vniust and vnholy they be made iust and holy, by any workes done by them, when they are naturally men, destitute of grace, but only by faith in Christ Iesus,* or thus. *No man merits grace to make him a good man of a bad, by any thing he doth before hee beleeue in Christ; but by beleeuing hee obtaineth this.* On the other side S. *Iames* saith that (*Abraham and all others are iustified by workes, not by faith only.*) *this* (say the *Romanists*) *is meant of the second iustification, and of such workes as are done after faith, by the aide of grace:* So the meaning of the *Proposition* shall be this. *Abraham and other men being once made good and iust. deserue to be made better, and more iust by such good workes as they performe through the helpe of Grace giuen vnto them; and not by faith only. Being once sanctified, they deserue the encrease of sanctification through that merit of their faith, and good workes out of Faith and Charity.*

Is not this difference betweene these *Apostles* finely accorded thinke you? They will now walke together being in this sort made friends through the mediation of the *Schoolemen,* but it is otherwise. They are so farre from reconciling them, that they haue abused them both, and set them farther asunder making them speake what they neuer meant. Neither in *S. Paul.* nor *S. Iames* is there any ground at all, whereon to raise such an interpretation of their words. And therefore wee respect this reconcilement, as the *shifting quericke* of a *Schoolemans* braine, that hath no footing at all in the text. Which wee doe vpon these reasons.

1 That distinction of *Iustification* (that is of sanctification)

tion) into the first giuing of it, and the after increase of it, (how soeuer tollerable in other matters) is vtterly to no purpose, as it is applied vnto the doctrine of these *Apostles*. Who when they speake of *Iustification* of a sinner in Gods sight doe vnderstand thereby the *Remission* of *Sins* through the imputation of Christ's Righteousnesse and not the infusion, or increase of *inherent sanctity* in the soule of man. This confusion of *Iustification* with *sanctification* is a prime error of our aduersaries in this article, as hath beene shewed, in clearing the acceptations of the word *Iustification*; and shall be shewed more at large in handling the forme of our *Iustification*.

2. The distinction of Iustification taken in their owne sense is falsely applied to S. *Iames* as if hee spake of the 2. *Iustification*, and to S. *Paul* as if he spake of the first. For first *Bellarmine* himselfe being iudge *S. Iames* in the example of *Rahab* speakes of the first iustification, because (as hee saith) shee was then, at the first made a beleeuer of an infidell, a righteous woman of an harlot. And againe *Paul* hee speakes of the 2 *Iustification* in the example of *Abraham*, which is alleaged by both the *Apostles*. Her's then a confusion insteed of a distinction. *Paul* speakes of the first, *Iames* speakes of the 2 and yet both doe speake of both *Iustifications*. Againe when they say *Iames* speakes of the second *Iustification*, whereby of a iust a man becomes more iust, 'tis a groundles imagination forasmuchas it was to no purpose for the *Apostle Iames* to treat of the second *Iustification*, whereby men grow better: when those *Hypocrites*, with whom hee had to doe, had erred from their first iustification, whereby they were not, as yet, made good, as the learned *Iackson* obserues. Nay there is not in all S. *Iames* his dispute, any sillable, that may giue any iust suspition that by *infi-*

[a] *Lib.4 de Iust. cap 18. Lorin in 11, 2.*

[b] *Iackson of Iust. Faith. S.2. cap.6.*

c *Loco supra citato.*

iustification, he meanes the increase of inherent iustice.[b] Bellarmine catcheth at the clause v.22. *(By workes faith was made perfect)* which is, in the *Iesuits* construction, *Abrahams inherent iustice, begun by faith, receiued increase and perfection by his workes)* But this is only the *Iesuites phrensie*. *Abraham* his faith and his Righteousnesse, whereof his faith is but a part, was not made but declared to be perfect, by so perfect a work which it brought forth, as, euen *Lorinus*, another of that *sect* expounds it *orthodoxly*.

3 Thirdly, that distinction of workes done before faith, without grace, & after faith by grace, is to as little purpose, as the former; in this matter of our *iustification*. Heretofore wee haue touched vpon that distinction and shewed the vanity thereof, in limiting Saint *Paul* to workes done without grace when simply he concludes all workes from our *iustification*. And *S. Iames* though hee require workes, of grace to bee ioyned with that faith which must iustifie vs: yet hee giues them not that place & office in our Iustification, from which *Paul* doth exclude them, and wherein our aduersaries would establish them, as it shall appeare anon.

Leauing then this *sophisticall reconcilement* coined by our aduersaries I come to those *reconciliations* which are made by our diuines, wherein we shall haue better *satisfaction* vpon better grounds. Two waies there are whereby this seeming difference is by our *men reconciled*.

1 The 1. by distinguishing the word *(iustification)* which may be taken either
1 *For the absolution of a Sinner in Gods iudgement.*
2 *For the declaration of a mans Righteousnesse before men.*

This distinction is certaine and hath its ground in Scripture which vseth the word *iustific* in both acceptions, for the

the quitting of vs in *Gods* sight, and for the manifestation of our innocency before man against accusation or suspicion of faultinesse. They apply this distinction for the reconciling of the two *Apostles* Thus. S^t. *Paul* speakes of *Iustification*, (*in foro Dei*) S. *Iames* speakes of Iustification (*in foro hominis*) *A man is iustified by faith without workes* saieth S. *Paul*: that is in God's sight, a man obtaines *remission of Sinnes* and is reputed just only for his *Faith* in *Christ*, not for his workes sake. *A man is iustified by workes; and not by Faith only* saith *S. Iames* that is, in mans sight wee are declared to be iust by our good workes, not by our faith only: which with other inward and invisible graces, are made visible vnto man only in the good workes, which they see vs performe. That this application is not vnfit for to reconcile this difference, may be shewed by the parts.

1 For S. *Paul* 'tis agreed on all sides that hee speakes of mans iustification in Gods sight. Rom. 3. v. 20.

2 For *S. Iames* we are to shew that with iust probability he may be vnderstood of the declaration of our *Iustification* and righteousnesse before men. For proofe whereof the Text affords vs these reasons.

1 Verse. 18. *Shew mee thy faith without thy workes & I will shew thee my faith by my workes.* Where the true *Christian* speaking to the *Hypocriticall* boaster of his faith, requires of him a declaration of his faith and *Iustification* thereby, by a reall proofe, not a verball profession, promising for his part to manifest and approue the truth of his owne *Faith* by his good workes. Whence it appeares, that before man, none can iustifie the soundnesse of his faith: but by his workes thence proceeding. 2. V. 21. *Abraham* is saied to be iustified when he offered vp his sonne *Isaack* vpon the *Altar*. Now 'tis manifest that *Abraham* was iustified in

Gods sight long before; euen. 25 yeares *Gen.*15.6. Therefore by that admirable worke of his in offering his sonne he was declared before all the world to be a iust man & a true Beleeuer. And for this purpose did God tempt *Abraham* in that triall of his faith: that thereby all beleeuers, might behold a rare patterne of a liuely and iustifying Faith, and that *Abraham* was not without good cause called the father of the *faithfull*.

3. V.22. It is said that *Abrahams faith* wrought with his worke and by workes was his *faith* made perfect. Which in the iudgement of *popish* [a] *Expositors* themselues, is to be vnderstood of the manifestation of *Abrahams faith* by his workes. His faith directed his workes: his workes manifested the power and perfection of his faith.

a *Lorin in Iacob.*

It is not then without good probability of *Reason*, that *Caluin* and other *expositors* on our side, haue giuen this solution vnto this doubt. [b] Bellarmine labours against it and would faine proue that iustification cannot be taken here *pro declaratione iustitiæ*. But his argument cannot much trouble any intelligent reader; and therefore I spare to trouble you with his *sophistry*.

b *Lib. 4. cap 18.*

This now is the first way of reconciling the places. Howbeit the truth is, that although this may bee defended against any thing that our aduersaries obiect to the contrary: yet many and those very learned diuines choose rather to tread in another path and more neerely to presse the *Apostles* steps; whom also in this point I willingly follow.

2 The second way then of reconciling these places, is by distinguishing of the word *(Faith)* which is taken in a double sense.

Gal.5.6.

1. First for that faith, which is true and liuing *(Πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, Faith which worketh through loue)* and

and is fruitfull in all manner of Obedience.

2. Secondly for that faith which is false and dead, being only a bare acknowledgement of the truth, of all articles of *Religion* accompanied with an outward formality of *Profession*: but yet destitute of *sincere obedience*.

This distinction of this word *(Faith)* is certaine by the *Scriptures*, as hath heretofore bin shewed in handling of that Grace. Our men now apply it thus *S. Paul* when he affirmes that wee are iustified by faith only, speakes of that faith which is true and liuing working by *Charity*. S. *Iames* when he denies a man is iustified by faith only, he disputes against that faith which is false and dead, without power to bring forth any good workes. So that the *Apostles* speake no *contradictions*, where *Paul* teacheth wee are iustified by a true *Faith*, and S. *Iames* affirmes wee are not iustified by a false *faith*. Againe *S. Paul* saith we are not iustified by works. S. *Iames* saith we are iustified by Workes. Neither is here any *contradiction* at all. For S. *Iames* vnderstands by *workes*, a *(working faith)* in opposition to the idle and dead faith before-spoken of *(by a Metonymie of the effect.)* Whence it is plaine that these two *Propositions (Wee are not iustified by workes)* which is *Pauls*, and *(We are iustified by a working Fath)* which is *Iames*, doe sweetly consort together. *Paul* seuers Works from our *iustification*, but not from our *Faith*. *Iames* ioyned workes to our faith, but not to our *Iustification*. To make this a little plainer by a *similitude* or twaine: there is great difference betweene these two sayings, *(A man liues by a reasonable soule)* and *(A man liues by Reason.)* The former is true, & shewes vs what *qualities* and power are *essentiall* vnto that *soule*, whereby a man liues. But the latter is false, because wee liue not by the quality, or *power* of *Reason*, though we liue by that soule which

hath that quality necessarily belonging to it, without which it is no *humane soule*. So also in these *Propositions*, (*Planta viuit per animam auctricem*) and *Planta vivit per augmentationem*) each *Puny* can tell that the former is true, & the other false. For although in the *Vegetiue soule* whereby *Plants* liue, there be necessarily required to the (*Being*) of it those 3 faculties of *Nourishment*, *Growth*, and *Procreation*: yet it is not the faculty of growing that giues life vnto *Plants*, for they liue when they grow not. In like manner. These two *Propositions* (*we are iustified by a working Faith*) and (*Wee are iustified by workes*) differ much. The first is true, and shewes vnto vs what *qualities* are necessarily required vnto the (*Being*) of that *Faith*, whereby the iust shall liue. Namely, that beside the power of beleeuing in the promise, there be also an *Habituall proneneſſe* and *Resolution* vnto the doing of all good *workes*, ioyned with it. But the later proposition is false. For although true faith bee equally as apt to worke in bringing forth *Vniuersall Obedience to Gods will*; as it is apt to beleeue and trust perfectly vnto God's promises; yet neuertheleſſe wee are not iustified by it as it brings forth good workes; but as it embraceth the promises of the *Gospell*. Now then *Iames* affirmes that which is true, that (*we are iustified by a working faith*) and S. *Paul* denies that which is false: viz. (*that wee are iustified by workes*.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The confirmation of the Orthodox reconciliation of S. Paul and S. Iames, by a Logicall Analysis of S. Iames his disputation in his second Chapter.

THis *Reconciliation* is the faireſt, and hath the moſt certaine grounds in the *text*. It will, I doubt not, appeare ſo vnto you, when it ſhall be cleered from theſe cavills that can be made againſt it. There are but only two things in it that may occaſion our aduerſaries to quarrell. The firſt is touching the word (*Faith*) wee ſay that *S. Iames* ſpeakes of a falſe and counterfeit faith. They ſay hee ſpeakes of that which is true, though *Dead* without workes. This is one point.[a]

[a] *Bell. lib. 1. de Iuſt. cap. 15.*

The ſecond is touching the *interpretation* of the word (*Workes*) vſed by *S. Iames* when he ſaieth, (*We are iuſtified by workes*) This wee interpret by a *Metonimy* of the *Effect* for the *Cauſe*, wee are iuſtified by a working faith, by that Faith which is apt to declare and ſhew it ſelfe in all good Workes. This interpretation may happily proue diſtaſtfull to their nicer *Palates*, who are very ready when it fits their humour, to grate ſore vpon the bare words and letter of a text. Theſe *cavills* remoued this *reconciliation* will appeare to be ſure and good. For the accompliſhment of this I ſuppoſe nothing will be more commodious, thē to preſent vnto you a brieſe reſolution of the whole diſpute of S. *Iames* touching *Faith*, that by a plaine and true expoſition thereof we may more eaſily diſcouer the *cauills* & *ſophiſticall forgeries* wherewith our aduerſaries haue peſtered this place of

Scripture. The disputation of S. *Iames* beginnes at the 14.v. of the second *Chapter* to the end thereof.

The scope and summe whereof is. A sharpe *reprehension* of *hypocriticall faith* of *vaine men* as they are called (v. 20) Which in the *Apostles* time vnder pretence of *Religion* thought they might liue as they list. Two extreames there were, whereunto these Iewes, to whom the *Apostle* writes, were mis-led by false teachers and their owne *corruptions*. The 1. That notwithstanding faith in Christ, they were bound to fulfill the whole law of *Moses*; Against which *Paul* disputes in his Epistle to the *Gal.* who also were infected with that Leauen. The other was, that *Faith* in *Christ* was sufficient without any regard of obedience, to the law: so they beleeued the *Gospell*, acknowledging the *Articles* of *Religion* for true, & made an outward profession all should be well, albeit in the meane time sanctity and sincere Obedience were quite neglected. The former error brought them in bondage: this made them licentious. A pleasing *heresy* if any other, whereof there were and will bee alwaies store of *sectaries* who content themselues to haue a forme of *Godlinesse*, but deny the power thereof. Against such *hypocrites* and vaine Boasters of false *Faith* and false *Religion*, S. *Iames* disputes in this place, shewing plainely that such men leaned on a staffe of *Reed*, deceiuing their owne selues with a counterfeit and shadow of true *Christian Faith* insteed of the *substance*. The reproofe with the maine *Reason* is expressed by way of *interrogation* in the (14. v.) *what doth it profit my brethren, though a man say he haue faith* (as many then did, & alwaies will say, boasting falsely of that which they haue not in truth,) *And haue not workes*; that is, Obedience to Gods Will, whereby to approue that *Faith* he boasts of? Can that *Faith saue him?* Is that faith without

without Workes a saving Faith that will bring a Man to *Heauen?* These sharpe Interrogations must be resolued into theire *strong Negations.* And so wee haue these two *Propositions.* 1 Containing the maine summe of the *Apostle's* dispute: The other a generall *Reason of it.* The 1 is this. *Faith without Obedience is vnprofitable.* The second prouing the first, is this. *Faith without Obedience will not saue a Man.* The whole *Argument* is. 1 Arg. of S. Iames.

That Faith which will not saue a man is vnprofitable, of no vse.

But the Faith which is without obedience will not saue: Ergo

Faith without obedience is vnprofitable.

The *Maior* of this *Argument* will easilie be graunted. *That it is an vnprofitable faith which will not bring a man to life and Happines.* But how doth S. *Iames* proue the *Minor. That a faith without workes will not doe that?* though it scarse need any proofe: yet becaus *hipocrisie* is euer armed with *sophistrie*, for a plainer *Conviction*, the *Apostle* proues it by this manner of *Argumentation.*

That faith which saues a man is a true faith.

But a Faith without workes is not a true faith. Ergo

A Faith without workes will not saue man.

The *Maior* is euident to all that haue *Reason.* The *Minor* S. *Iames* proues by diuerse *Arguments.*

1. The first is contained v. 15. 16. 17. and it is drawne *à pari*, from comparison with another like vertue. Namely *Charity* towards the poore. The *Argument* is thus. If *Charity towards the poore professed in words, but without workes be counterfeit, then faith in God professed in like manner without Obedience is also counterfeite not true. But Charity towards the poore in words professed without deeds is a coun*

terfeit

terfeit charity. Ergo, Faith in God without obedience is a counterfeit and false faith.

The Reason of the *maior proposition* is euident, from the *similitude* that is betweene all vertues and graces. There is no vertue, but men may *counterfeit* and falsely arrogate it to themselues, as they may boast of a false faith, so also (as *Salomon* and experience speakes) of a false *liberality*, false *Valour*, false *Prudence*, &c. Now there is but one way to discouer this counterfeiting in any kind, and that is to goe from wordes to workes, from presumptions and boastings to actions. This way all count most certaine, nor will any man beleeue words against workes, or be perswaded by faire speaches, that the *habites* of vertues and *graces* bee truely seated in his mind, whose tongue tells vs they be so: but his doings confute his sayings. Wherefore the *Apostle* in his comparison proceeds on an vndeniable ground. Now for the *minor (that the charity which is rich in good words, and poore in almes deeds, is not true but counterfeit pitty)* the *Apostle* shewes by an ordinary instance *(If a brother or sister be naked or destitute of daily food)* that is. If a beleeuing *Christan* want food and raiment or other necessaries *(and one of you say vnto them, depart in peace, and be yee warmed & filled)* If he giue him kinde words, *Alas poore soule I pitty thee and wish thee well, I would I had to giue thee, goe in Gods name where thou mayest be releiued*, & so let him passe with a few pittifull complements, *notwithstanding yee giue them not those things which are needfull for the body: what doth it profit.* Is the poore mans backe euer the warmer? Or his belly the fuller, with a few windy complements? Can such a man perswade any that hee hath in him indeed the *bowells* of mercy and compassion towards the needy, when they find such cold entertainment at his gates. 'Tis manifest that

that this is but a meere mockery, and that such pittifull words come not from a heart that's truely mercifull. The *Apostle* now applies this touching *Charity*, vnto *Faith*. v.17. *Euen so faith if it haue not workes is dead being alone.* As that *Charity*, so also that *Faith* which men professe without obedience is false and fained, and therefore vnprofitable to saue a man. *It is dead.* How must this be vnderstood? *Faith* is a quality of the soule, & qualities are then said to be dead, when they are extinguished. As if we should say such a mans *Charity* is dead; it is because he hath lost it; that which was in him is abolished. But this is not the meaning. For then when S. *Iames* saith *that faith is dead being alone*: his meaning should bee that Faith seuered *from Workes, is no faith at all: but quite extinguished.* Now this is not so For ther's a *Faith* seuered from Workes in *Hypocrites, Hæretiques, Reprobates* and *Diuells.* Which *Faith* is a generall assent to all diuine truthes: and this *Faith* in them hath a true being, but no sauing vse. Wherefore it is called a dead faith in regard of the effect: because 'tis nothing auaileable to bring them, in whom it is, to life and Saluation, as a true and liuing faith is. Here our aduersaries haue much strange contemplation, telling vs that *Faith* without works though it be a dead faith, yet 'tis a true *faith.* Euen as an instrument is a true instrument, though it be not vsed. So that in their *Philosophy* 'tis one and the same true *Faith* which is dead without, and liuing with workes. Euen as 'tis one and the same Body which liues with the soule & is dead without it: or as water is the same whether it stand still in a *Cesterne* or runne in a *Riuer.* Whence they proceed to discourse that *Charity* is the forme of faith: & conclude that it is not the *inward and Essentiall* forme of it, as the *soule* is the *forme* of a man (for that workes are not *essenti-*

all to *Faith*) nor the *accidentall forme* as whiteneſſe is of *Paper*; becauſe faith according to their *Schooles*, is in the vnderſtanding, and *Charity* in the *will*: But it is the externall *Forme* of it, becauſe it giues to *Faith* a *merit* and *worthineſſe* for the deſeruing of Heauen. Theſe fond *ſpeculations* of the *forme* and *merit* of Faith I paſſe by now, hauing touched vpon them heretofore. To that which they ſay. That a liuing faith, and a dead *Faith* is one & the ſame true faith: 'tis vtterly falſe, they differ as much as light and darkneſſe. 1. In their ſubiect, a dead faith is in the *Reprobate Man* & *Diuills*. *A liuing faith* only in the *Elect*: 2. *In* their *Obiect*. A dead *Faith* aſſents to diuine *Revelations* as barely true or good onely in the *generall*: a liuing faith aſſents to them, as truer and better in themſelues; then any thing that can be ſet againſt them. 3 in their nature. A dead faith is no ſanctifying Grace: but a common gift of creation as in the diuell; of ordinary illumination as in *Reprobate men*. A liuing faith is a ſanctifying grace, a part of inherent holineſſe wrought in the heart by the ſpeciall power of the *Holy Ghoſt*. All which haue bin heretofore cleared in handling the *Nature* of *Faith*. Wherefore vnto thoſe *arguments* or *Sophiſmes* rather, which [a] *Bellarmine* brings to proue that *Iames* ſpeakes of a true *diuine*, *infuſed*, *Catholique*, *Chriſtian* Faith, though it be dead faith; I anſwere briefely. That we grant a dead faith to be a true faith: but it is in its kind. Becauſe it hath a true being in men and diuels, in whom it is, and 'tis directed toward true obiects: But it is not that true Faith which is *Catholique Chriſtian* and *ſauing*. This is of another kinde, and in compariſon of this, that other is but a meere *ſhaddow* and *counterfeit* reſemblance of true *Faith*. Wherefore when thoſe *Hypocrites* accounted themſelues to haue that *faith* which is truely *Chriſtian* and *ſauing*, S. *Iames*

[a] *Lib.1.de Iuſt. cap.15.*

Iames shewes them that this their faith which was alone naked of obedience, was nothing so: but a *Faith* of another kind, a dead *faith*, hauing onely a false shew of a true and liuing *faith*. This of the first Argument.

2 The 2d Argument is contained v. 18. being drawne from an impossibility, in prouing the truth of it. The argument stands thus. 2 Arg. of S. Iames

That faith, which is truely Christian may be shewen and proued so to be.
But a faith without workes cannot bee demonstrated to be a true faith.
Ergo. A Faith without workes is no true Faith.

The maior is omitted as most euident of it selfe. Because there is no *morall* vertue, or grace of the *Holy Ghost* truely planted in the heart: but it may be knowne by some externall actions, which it is apt to bring forth. Euen as life is knowne by breathing, or beating of the *Pulse*. The truth of an inuisible grace hath its demonstation in visible workes. But now for the *Minor S. Iames* proues that faith without obedience cannot appeare by any proofe to be true faith. Which he doth in a dialogue betweene a true beleeuer and a *Hypocrite*. *Yea a man may say, thou hast faith, and I haue Workes shew mee thy faith without workes, and I will shew thee my faith by my workes.* That is. Thou saiest thou hast a true faith, though thou hast no *workes*: I say I haue true faith because I haue workes. Come wee now to the triall, and let it appeare who saieth true, thou or I. If thou saiest true, proue thy faith by something or other to be true. Shew me thy faith [b] without thy workes. Workes thou hast none, whereby to shew thy faith, make it then appeare by something else. But thats impossible. Where *workes* are wanting, ther's no demonstration else whereby to iustifie the truth

b Ἐκτῶν ἔργων, or χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων, not ἐκ τῶν ἔργων, The former reading is most agreeable to the argument of the Apostle. So the Syriack Beza, the vulgar, the French, our last Translators. Pareus followes the other reading ἐκ τῶν ἔργων. & so piscator. But they giue no good reason of this their so doing. The change was easie from ἐκ τῶν into ἐν τοῖς.

truth of *faith*. And therefore thou art driuen to confesse that thou vainely boastest of that which thou hast not. But on the other side (*saith the true beleeuer*) I can make good, that which I say, prouing that my faith is true by my works. *I will shew thee my faith by my workes*. My sincere Obedience is a reall demonstration: that my beleife is no verball ostentation and vaine bragge. This proofe of S. *Iames* is very conuincing, and gripes the *Consciences* of Hypocrites, smiting them with shame and confusion when they come to this triall; and so haue their false and fraudulent hearts laid open. But here it will bee asked what workes doe demonstrate the truth of faith, and also how they doe proue it. Whereto we answere works are of two sotts. 1 *Ordinarily*, such workes of *Sanctity* and *Obedience*, as are required to a holy *Conuersation*. 2 *Extraordinarily*. viz. *Miracles*. Wee say S. *Iames* vnderstands the former, and those only: our aduersaries conclude both. But erroneously, for asmuch as S. *Iames* speakes not of the doctrine of *faith*, but of the grace of *faith*. The grace requires good workes of *Piety* and *Charity* as perpetually necessary for the confirmatiō of its truth. So doth not the doctrine of faith alwaies require *Miraculous workes* for the confirmation of its diuinity: But onely at the first *publication* thereof. Wherefore *Lorinus* is very *ridiculous*, who vpon this place tells vs, that they may iustly demaund of vs *Heretiques* (For so they bedust vs) *Miracles* for the confirmation of our new and false doctrine. Indeed were it new & false their request were not vnreasonable, that wee should make our doctrine credible by doing of miracles. But sure the *Iesuite* iudgeth of our doctrine by his owne, which did he not suspect for a new error, wee see no reason they should still require *miracles* for confirmation of an olde truth for our selues we seeke not the aide of a liuing wonder

wonder to vphold a true doctrine: nor doe wee count it any disgrace at all to our religion, that we cannot by our faith so much as cure a lame horse, as the *Iesuite* out of [a] *Eras.* scoffs at vs. Now surely if such a beast as *Bellarmine's* devout Mare, want helpe to set her on all foure, we cannot bee yet so well perswaded of that vertue of *Romish faith*, as to think that a *Frier* will doe more good at such a jadish miracle, then a *Farrier*. But whereas the *Iesuite* goes forward to require of vs the other sort of good workes, of *Piety* & *Charity* for the demonstration of our faith he hath reason so to doe, though not so much as he imagines, when hee chargeth vs with neglect of good workes and vnbridled licentiousnesse. Would to God we could cleere our practise from such neglect, as well as we can our doctrine from teaching it. But yet by their fauour, if we come to comparison, we know no reason why we should runne behinde the dore, as more ashamed of our practises, then they may iustly bee of theirs, in which case we boldly bid him amongst them, that is without sinne to cast the first stone at vs. To proceed. Seeing workes of obedience are the *prooues* of a true *Faith*, it must be considered in what sort they proue it. For may not good workes be counterfeited as well as Faith? I answere. That in this triall the iudgement of *verity* and *infallibility* belongeth vnto God, who only knowes the heart and conscience, being able to discerne euery secret working of the soule, and so to iudge exactly whether or no all outward appearances come from inward *syncerity*. But for the iudgement of *Charity* that belongs to vs. If wee behold in any man the Workes of obedience to Gods will; of such a man we are to iudge that he hath true *Faith*. Though yet herein we must as farre as humane frailty will giue leaue, iudge also not according to appearance, but iudge righteous iudge-

[a] *De lib. arbit.*

ment. Mens practises must be examined: if *hypocrisie* bewray it selfe (as 'tis hard for a *Counterfeit* not to forget himselfe at some one time or other, if he be duly obserued) there *Charity* must not be blinde: it must see and censure it. 'Tis not a charitable, but a peruerse iudgement to call euil good: nor is it any offence to call that a barren or bad tree, that beares either no fruit at all, or none but bad: And thus of this second *Argument* of the *Apostle*, that these *Hypocrites faith* was vaine, because, when it comes to the proofe, it cannot be iustified to be sound and good.

3 The third Argument is v. 19. from the example of the Diuels themselues, in whom there is a faith without workes, as well as in *hypocrites*: and *ergo* it is in neither of them a true Faith. The Argument is brought in to confute a cauill which the *hypocrite* might make against the former reason. True might he say, I cannot shew my *Faith* by my workes: yet for all that I haue a true faith. And why? Because I beleeue the Articles of *Religion*, that there is one God, with the rest. Hereto the Apostle replies. That such a beliefe is not a true *Christian faith*, because it is to be found euen in the Diuels. The Argument runnes thus.

That faith which is in the Diuels is no true Christian Faith.

But a bare assent to the Articles of Religion without Obedience is in the Diuels. Ergo.

A bare assent without obedience is no true Christian Faith.

The *Maior* of this *Argument* will easily be granted. That the Diuels haue not that true Faith which is required of a *Christian* Man to his saluation. The *Minor* is also euident. That the diuels doe believe the Articles of *Christian Religion*. St *Iames* instances in one for the rest, namely the *Article*

of

of the *Godhead*, whereto the diuels assent as well as *Hypocriticall men*. *Thou beleeuest that there is one God*, saith the true beleeuer to the *hypocrite*, pleading that hee beleiued the Articles of faith. *Thou doest well.* 'Tis a laudable and good thing to acknowledge the truth of Religion. But withall thou must knowe that the diuels deserue as much commendation for this beleefe, as thou doest. *The Diuells also beliue.* Euen they confesse the truth of that and the other *Articles* of *Religion*. An evident proofe whereof is this, that *they tremble* at the power, wrath, and iustice of God, and the remembrance of the last iudgement, which did they not beliue, they would not feare: but now they expect it with horrour, because they knowe it will come vpon them. Whence 'tis plaine that the Faith of *Hypocrites* and Diuels is all one, neither better then other, both vnfruitfull to bring forth obedience, both vnprofitable to bring vnto saluation, and therefore neither of them that true faith, which is *Christian* and saving. This argument of the *Apostle*, pincheth our Aduersaries sore, who stiffely maintaine that St *Iames* speakes of a true, though of a dead faith. For they cannot for shame say that there is a true faith in the diuells & damned Spirits. But yet S. *Iames* hath concluded that they haue that dead faith which *Hypocrites* boast of. What then? Then a dead faith is no true faith, as our[a] aduersaries affirme it is. Wherefore to helpe themselues, they deny that it is one & the same dead faith, which is in Hypocrites and euill Spirits. Indeed *ex parte obiecti*, tehy grant that the faith of diuells is as true and *catholique* as that of wicked men, because they both beliue the same things. And also in regard of the *effects*, they grant their faith to be alike, because both bee vnfruitfull. But not *ex parte subiecti*, so they say there's much difference. The faith of diuels is of one sort, and the faith of

[a] *Fell. lib. 1. de iustif. cap. 15.*

Hypocrites

Hypocrites of another. But here they make a little to bold with the blessed *Apostle*, ouerturning the force of his argument, to vphold their owne fancy. The Apostle proues against *Hypocrites* that their idle faith without obedience is not true sauing faith. Why? Because the diuels idle faith destitute of obedience is no true sauing faith. But now. Is the faith of diuels and hypocrites of the same kinde and nature, Yea, or no? No, they be not, they be of a diuerse nature, say the aduersaries. Let it be then considered, what force there is in the *Apostles* argument, *Faith without workes in diuels saues them not. Ergo faith without workes in wicked men, saues them not.* Might not one prompted by a *Iesuite*, reply vpon the *Apostle*. Nay by your leaue, your argument is inconsequent, because you doe not dispute, *ad idem*. Faith in the diuels is of one kinde, Faith in Hypocrites is of another: and therefore though faith without workes cannot saue diuels; yet faith without workes may saue men. Thus were the Apostles argument laid in the dust, if these mens opinions may stand for good. But would you knowe what distinction these men make betweene the faith of Diuels and wicked men, which S. *Iames* takes for the same. Tis thus. First the faith of euill men is free, the faith of diuels is compelled and extorted from them by a kinde of *force*. So [b] *Bellarmine* [*Fides hominum malorum libera est, captivante nimirùm piâ voluntate intellectum in obsequium Christi: Fides verò Dæmonum est coacta, & extracta ab ipsa rerum evidentiâ. Quod insinuavit idem Iacobus dicens, Dæmones credunt, & contremiscunt. Nos enim non credimus contremiscentes, id est, inviti & coacti, sed sponte & libenter.* Wicked men beleeue freely and willingly. Why? Because their pious and godly will captiuates their vnderstanding to the obedience of *Christ*, so causing it to assent vnto the truth. The Diuels beleeue

b *Vt supra.*

beleeue vpon compulsion, being forced to it by the euidence of the things themselues. Which Saint *Iames* intimates, *They beleeue and tremble*: that is, they beleeue against their wills.] Is not this a shameleſſe *Ieſuite* that will say any thing to patch vp a broken cause? For bee not these absurd cõtradictions to say, that wicked men haue godly wills, that by a pious motion of the will, their vnderstanding is captiuated to the obedience of Christ, and yet they be *hypocrites* and wicked men still. No man can reliſh such assertions; who knowes how averſe and fromward the will of men is to embrace any thing that is of God, till such time as it be regenerate by sanctifying grace. It is therefore without all reason, to affirme that wicked men beleeue willingly, and 'tis against all experience, which shewes that vngodly men are vtterly as vnwilling to beleiue any truth that makes against them in any kinde whatsoeuer; as a *Beare* is to bee brought to the *stake*. Indeed in matters that like them, or such as bee of an indifferent nature, neither fauoring nor crossing their corruptions, they'll be apt to beleeue, though not out of a pious affection, as the *Ieſuite* dreames: but out of ſelfe-loue and other *ſelfe conſiderations*. But take them in any other point of *Religion*, that doth any way grate vpon their wicked affections, all the perſwasion and instruction in the world, cannot worke them to a beleife of it, till the *Conſcience* (ſpite of their hearts) bee conuicted by some notable euidence of the truth. Now what elſe can be said of the diuels; who will as willingly beleiue what makes for them, (if any thing did) or what makes not against them, as any wicked man can doe? And they are as vnwilling to beleiue any thing, that makes against them, as any wicked man is. Nor would they beleiue it, did not the cleerenesſe of diuine *Reuelations* conuince them of the certaine truth thereof. So that there is no

difference at all in this respect, as the one, so the other beleeue vnwillingly; as diuells, so wicked men beleeue with trembling. The diuels indeed with greater horror, as their beleefe and knowledge is alwaies more distinct then Mans: but yet men with horror too, when their consciences by fits are awakned to behold the woes, that are comming vpon them. Vnto this difference of *Bellarmine* [c] others adde two more. Namely: 1 *That the faith of diuels is naturall; that of wicked men supernaturall and infused.* 2 *That the faith of divels is dishoneſt, the faith of wicked men is an honeſt faith.* Whereto we say thus much. That touching the first difference, we grant indeed that the Faith of the diuels is not *supernaturall* except it be in regard of the *object*. The faculties which they receiued in their creation are not so far corrupted in them: but that they are able to assent vnto, and apprehend diuine reuelations without further helpe, then of their owne naturall abilities. Man in his fall sustained greater losse in the spirituall powers of his soule, and therefore stands in need of helpe. Which helpe is afforded euen vnto the vngodly; but this is by ordinary illumination, not by speciall infusion of any sanctifying grace. Enlightned they are aboue the ordinary pitch of naturall blindnesse: but not aboue that whereto a meere naturall vnderstanding may be aduanced. Yea were mans vnderstanding raised vp to that perfection which is in diuels: this were more then Nature, yet lesse then grace. This common gift of illumination bestowed on wicked men, but not on diuells, is no proofe that their faith is of a diuerse kinde. As to the last difference we are not so farre studied in moralities, as to conceiue wherein the dishonesty of the diuel's faith, and the honesty of Hypocrites faith doth lye. To ordinary vnderstanding it seemes every way as honest and commendable a matter, for a wicked

[c] *Becanus.*

ked fiend, as for a wicked man, to beleiue what God reueals vnto him: If not, we must expect to bee further informed by these *Iesuites, men* that are better read in that part of *Ethicks* whether diabolicall or hypocriticall.

4 This of the *Apostles* third Argument. We come to the fourth. 4. Arg. of S. Iames.

The fourth Argument is contained in the 20.21.22.23.24 25. verses. Before which the *Apostle* repeates his maine conclusion. That faith without obedience is a false & dead faith. *But wilt thou knowe, O* [a] *vaine man* (or hypocrite) *that faith without workes is dead?* v.20. For the convincing of him further, hee proceeds to a new Argument to proue it vnto him. [a] κενὲ as an empty Vessell without liquor

The Argument is this.

That faith which will not iustifie a man is a false & dead faith.

But the faith which is without workes will not iustifie a Man. Ergo

'Tis a dead and a false faith.

The *Maior* the Apostle omits as most euident of it selfe. The *Minor* hee proues by an induction of two Examples. Thus.

If Abraham and Rahab were iustified by a working faith, then that faith which is alone without works will not iustifie.

But Abraham and Rahab were so iustified, viz. by a working faith. Ergo

Faith without workes will not iustifie a man.

The reason of the *consequence* is manifest. Because as *Abraham* & *Rahab*: so all other must be iustified. The meanes of iustification and life, were euer one and the same for all men. Which also the *Apostle* intimates in that clause v.21. *Was not our father Abraham, &c.* implying that as the Fa-

ther, so also the children, the whole stocke and generation of the Faithfull, were and are still iustified by one vniforme meanes. The two instances the *Apostle* vrges, that of *Abraham*, v. 21.22.23. that of *Rahab*, v. 25. The *conclusion* which equally issues from them both, hee interserts in the middest, after the allegation of *Abrahams example*, v. 24. I shall goe ouer them as they lye in the Text.

In the example of *Abraham*, the *Apostle* v. 21. sets downe this *proposition*. *That Abraham was iustified by a working faith*. For this interrogatiue: *Was not our father Abraham iustified by workes?* Must bee resolued into an affirmatiue *Abraham our father was iustified by workes*. That is a *working faith*. Which proposition the *Apostle* confirmeth by it's parts. 1. Shewing that *Abrahams* faith was an operatiue faith declared and approued by his workes. Secondly, proving that by such a working faith *Abraham* was iustified in God's sight. That the faith of *Abraham* was operatiue, full of life and power to bring forth *Obedience* vnto God, the *Apostle* alleageth one instance insteed of all the rest to proue it. And that is that singular worke of *Obedience* vnto Gods command. *When hee offered vp his Sonne Isaack vpon the Altar*. Many other workes there were performed by *Abraham* abundantly iustifying the truth of his *faith*: But the *Apostle* chooseth this aboue all other, as that worke which was of purpose enioyned him by God for a triall of his faith. Wherein *Abraham* mightily ouercomming all those strong temptations to disobedience & infidelity, made it appeare, that his faith was not an idle, dead, and empty *Speculation*, but an actiue and working grace. Wherefore the *Apostle* addes, v. 22. *Seest thou how faith wrought with his workes, and by workes was faith made perfect?* That is, as in other workes of that holy *Patriarch*, so specially in that sacrificing his

his *son*, all that can see, may plainely behold, the strength & life of his faith. *Faith wrought with his workes.* That is. His faith directed & supported him in the doing of that work, as the *Apostle Paul* expounds it. *Heb.* 11.17. *By faith Abraham offered vp Isaack:* that worke had not beene done, if faith had not wrought it. In euery circumstance thereof *faith* did all in all from the beginning of the worke to the end. This interpretation is most simple and generallly receiued. *Faith wrought with*: That is, In or by his workes, vnto the performance whereof the force of faith was in speciall manner assisting. *Pareus* reads the words by a [a] *tmesis.* Πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις, (that is) ἡ πίστις ἡ σὺν τοῖς ἔργοις ἤργει (*scil.*) τὴν δικαίωσιν. i.e. *Faith being with his workes wrought. What? his Iustification.* But his construction seemes somewhat hard and not necessary for this place. The other sense is much plainer, shewing vs by or with what vertue *Abrahams* workes were wrought. viz. By the vertue of his *faith*, which in most powerfull manner incited and inabled him to obey. The *Apostle* goes forward, *And by workes was faith made perfect.* That is declared to bee perfect. [b] For workes did not perfect *Abrahams faith essentially*, in asmuch as long before this time, it was perfect, as is plaine in that *Abraham* was iustified by it 25 yeares before the oblation of his sonne *Isaack*, and also by the strength of his faith had done many excellent workes and obtained great blessings at the hand of God. So that the offering vp of *Isaack* was not the cause but a fruite of the perfection of *Abrahams faith*, the great difficulty of that worke shewed the singular perfection of that *Grace* which was able so to encounter and conquer it. The goodnesse of the fruite doth not worke, but declare the goodnesse that is in the tree; the qualities of the fruits alwaies depending vpon the nature of the tree: but not on the

a As in other words vsed by this Apostle viz. καταδυναστεύουσιν. cap. 2. v. 6. κατακαυχῶσθαι, chap 2. v. 13 καταλαλεῖτε. ch. 4. 11.

b. As the Angel expounds it. *Gen.* 22.12. Now I knowe that thou fearest God: seeing for my sake thou hast not spared thine onely sonne.

contrary. Thus then the first part of the proposition is plainely proued by the *Apostle*. That *Abrahams* Faith was a liuely and working Faith declaring and approuing its own truth by the works of his *Obedience*.

The next part. Namely. *That Abraham was iustified in Gods sight, by such a working faith*, he proues. 1. By a Testimony of Scripture. 2. By an *effect* or consequent thereof. Both are expressed in the 23.v. The first in these words. *And the Scripture was fulfilled which saieth. Abraham beleeued God, and it was imputed vnto him for righteousnesse.* The application of this testimony is very heedfully to bee obserued, because it serues excellently for the clearing of the *Apostles* meaning, when hee saith wee are iustified by workes. *And the Scripture was fulfilled* saith S. *Iames*. When? At the time that *Isaack* was offered. But was it not fulfilled before that time? Yes. Many yeares, when the promise of the blessed-seed was made vnto him, as appeares *Gen.*15.6. Wence this testimony is taken. How was it then fulfilled at the oblation of *Isaack*? Thus. The truth of that which was verified before, was then againe confirmed by a new and euident experiment. Well. Thus much is plaine enough. But here now the difficulty is, how this Scripture is applied vnto the *Apostles* former dispute. In the 21.v. He saieth that *Abraham* was iustified by Workes when hee offered *Isaack*. How proues he, that he was so iustified? Why by this testimony. Because the Scripture was fulfilled at that time, which saieth, *Abraham beleeued God, &c.* Marke then the *Apostles* argument. *When Abraham offered Isaack the scripture was fulfilled which saith Abraham was iustified by faith.* For that's the meaning of that Scripture. *Ergo, Abraham when hee offered Isaack was iustified by workes.* This at first sight seemeth farre fet, and not onely besides, but quite contrary

to

to the *Apostles* purpose to proue hee was then iustified by workes, because the scripture saieth, he was then iustified by *Faith.* But vpon due consideration, the inference appeares to be euident, and the agreement easie, The *Apostle* and the *Scripture* alleaged, haue one and the same meaning: the Scripture saieth. He was iustified by faith, meaning, as all confesse, a working faith fruitfull in obedience. S. *Iames* affirmes the very same, saying, that hee was iustified by workes, that is *Metonymically* by a working faith. And therefore the *Apostle* rightly alleadgeth the Scripture for confirmation of his assertion: the Scripture witnessing. *That by Faith he was iustified*; the *Apostle* expounding what manner of *Faith* it meanes. Namely a faith with workes or a working faith. So that the *application* of this testimony vnto that time of offering vp of *Isaack* is most excellent: because then it appeared manifestly what manner of faith it was, wherefore God had accounted him iust in former times. Without this *Metonimy* it appeares not that there is any force in the application of this Scripture and the argument from thence. The Scripture witnesseth that *Abraham* was then iustified by Faith. *Ergo* 'tis true, that he was then iustified by workes. What *consequence* is there in this argument except wee expound S. *Iames* by that *metonimie*, Workes, that is a working *Faith*? And so the argument holds firme. Take it otherwise, as our aduersaries would haue it, or, to speake truth, according to the former interpretation of our diuines; it breeds an absurd construction either way. *Abraham* in offering *Isaack* was iustified by works that is, *secundâ Iustificatione* of good hee was made better. How is that proued? By scripture. Because the *Scripture saieth.* That at that time he was iustified by faith. That is, *primâ Iustificatione* of bad he became good. Is not this most apparant

Non-

Non-sence. Againe according to the interpretations of our diuines, *Abraham* at the offering vp of *Isaack* was iustified by workes (that is, say they) declared iust before men. How is that proued? By Scripture. Because the Scripture saieth. That at that time, he was iustified by faith. That is, accounted iust in Gods sight. In which kinde of arguing I must confesse I apprehend not how there is any tolerable consequence. Wherefore wee expound S. *Iames metonymically*, putting the *effect* for the *cause*, workes, for a working faith, as the necessary connexion of the text enforceth vs. Nor is there any harshnesse at all, nor violent straining in this figure, when two things of necessary and neere dependance one vpon the other, (*as workes, and a working faith*) are put one for another. Neither haue our aduersaries more cause to complaine of vs for this figuratiue interpretation of workes, then we haue of them for their figuratiue interpretation of faith. For when wee are saied to be iustified by *faith*, they vnderstand it *dispositiue & meritorie* not *formaliter faith* in it selfe is not our sanctification, nor yet the cause of it. But it merits the bestowing of it, and disposeth vs to receiue it. Let reason iudge now, which is the harsher exposition. Theirs? *Faith iustifies* (that is) *Faith is a disposition in vs deseruing that God should sanctifie vs by infusion of the habit of Charity.* Or ours? *Workes iustifie*, that is, *the Faith whereby wee are acquited in Gods sight, is a working Faith.* Thus much of this Testimony of Scripture proouing that *Abraham* was iustified by a true and working *Faith.*

In the next place the *Apostle* shewes it by a visible effect or *Consequent* that followed vpon his iustification expressed in the next words: *And hee was called the friend of God.* A high prerogatiue, for God the *Creator* to reckon of a poore

mortall

mortall man as his familiar friend; but so entire & true was the *faith of Abraham*, so vpright was his heart, that God not only gratiously accounted it to him for *Righteousnesse*: but also in token of that gratious acceptance entered into a league with *Abraham* taking him for his especiall friend and confederate; A league offensiue and defensiue. God would be a friend to *Abraham* [*Thou shalt be a blessing*] & a friend of *Abrahams* friends. *I will blesse them that blesse thee*; and an enimie of *Abrahams* enimies: *I will curse them that curse thee.* Which league of friendship with *Abraham* before the offering vp of *Isaack* was therevpon by solemne protestation and oath renued, as wee haue it, *Gen.22.verse 16.&c.* Gen.12.2.3.

Thus wee haue this first example of *Abraham.* From thence the *Apostle* proceeds to a generall *conclusion* in the next verse (24) *Yee see then how that by workes a man is iustified, and not by faith only.* That is, therefore it is euident. That a man is iustified by a working faith: not by a faith without workes. Which *Metonymicall* interpretation is againe confirmed by the inference of this conclusion vpon the former verse. The scripture saith, *That Abraham beleeved God and it was imputed vnto him for righteousnesse. Ergo* (saith *S.Iames*) *Yee see how a man is iustified by workes, and not by faith only.* A man might here say. Nay rather. We see the contrary. That a man is iustified by faith only and not by workes. For in that place of Scripture there is no mention at all made of Workes. Wherefore of necessity we must vnderstand them both in the same sense. And so the conclusion followes directly. That euery man is iustified by an actiue not an idle faith, because the Scripture witnesseth that *Abraham* was iustified by the like faith. Our aduersaries collection then from this place. [*That faith and workes*

be compartners in iustification, wee are iustified partly by faith, partly by workes] is vaine & inconsequent. For when the *Apostle* saies, *A man is iustified by workes & not by faith only*, his meaning is not, that workes and faith are two co-ordinate causes by their ioint-force working our iustification; but the *Apostle* vtterly excludes faith onely from iustification, and attributes it wholy vnto workes. For by πίστιν μόνον *Faith only*, he vnderstands *faith* alone, that faith which is καθ' ἑαυτὴν, v. 17. alone, solitary, by it selfe, without workes. And such a dead faith whereof these *hypocrites* boasted, St *Iames* excludes wholly from justifying of a man. *I say then that he is not iustified by faith only: but that he is iustified by workes.* That is a working faith that is fruitfull in Obedience.

3. Example. The *Apostle* goes forward from the example of *Abraham* vnto that of *Rahab*, verse 25. *Likewise was not Rahab the Harlot iustified by workes?* That is in the same manner as *Abraham*: *so also Rahab* was iustified by a working faith. Which appeared to be so by that which she did *when shee receaued the messengers*, entertained the two spies which were sent to search the land, lodged them in her house without discouering them. And when by accident they were made knowne, hid them secretly vpon the roofe, and afterwards *sent them out another way*, conveied them away priuily, not by the vsuall, but by another way (that is) through the window letting them downe ouer the *wall by a cord*, as the story hath it. *Ios.* 2. In this dangerous enterprise, wherein this weake woman ventured her life in succouring the enmiies of her *King* and *Country*: it appeares plainely that she had a strong and liuely faith in the *God* of *Israel*: & that the confession which shee made with her mouth to the *spies* [*The Lord your God, he is the God in Heauen aboue and in*

in the earth beneath. Iosh.2.11.] proceeded from a truly believing heart, insomuch as her words were made good by workes, that followed them. Wherefore the Apostle iustly parallels these two examples of *Abraham* offering his sonne; and *Rahab* in the kinde vsage of the *Spies*, because both those facts were singular trialls of a liuely faith which was able in that sort to ouercome what was hardest to bee conquered. viz. Naturall affection. In *Abraham* both fatherly affection to the life of a deere and only sonne: and in *Rahab* the naturall loue to ones country and a mans owne life did all stoope and giue way, when once true faith commands obedience. Here againe our aduersaries trouble themselues, and the Text with needlesse *speculations* telling vs, that now the *Apostle* hath altered his cliffe, and is gone from the second iustification in *Abrahams* example, to the first iustification in this of *Rahab*. That *Rahab* was conuerted at this time of receiuing the *spies* being made a believer of an infidell, a good woman of a bad. That shee by this good worke did expiate her former sinnes and merited the grace and fauour of God, notwithstanding that shee committed a *veniall sinne* in handling of the businesse, telling a downe-right lye, which though shee should not haue done; yet it hindred not the meritoriousnesse of the worke, with such other fond imaginations peruerting the simplicity of the truth. But first they are not agreed among themselues whether the *Apostle* doe in that sort shift from one *Iustification* to another. *Bellarmine* affirmes it and many moe. But others deny it, as may be seene in *Lorinus* his exposition of the 21.v. of this *Chapter*. And were they agreed vpon it, sure I am they should disagree from the *Apostle*, who makes this second instance of the same nature with the former. Ὁμοίως. In like manner saith he, was *Rahab* iustified: viz. as *Abraham*

was. Againe when they say *Rahab* became a true beleiuer at that time of receiuing the *spies*, not before, 'tis more then they can proue. By the circumstances of the story it appears plainely, that she beleeued before they came, by the relation of the great workes which God had done for his *people*, and the promises that were made vnto them, that they should possesse *Rahabs* countrey. This bred feare in others: but faith in her, by the secret working of the *holy Ghost*: See *Iosh.* 2.9.&c. And certainely, (had shee not had *Faith*, before the *spies* came, who can thinke she would haue giuen entertainment to such dangerous persons? But shee knewe them to bee the seruants of the God of *Israel* in whom shee
a Heb.11.31. beleiued; and therefore by this a faith shee receaued them peaceably; though Enimies of her countrey. Lastly to that of the *Meritoriousnesse* of the worke of *Rahab*, to deserue *Grace* and *Life eternall*; we reiect it, not only as a vaine but an impious conceit, which neuer entred into the humble hearts of the Saints of old: but hath beene set on foot in the last corrupt ages of the world by Men drunken with selfe loue, and admiration of their owne *Righteousnesse*.

Thus we haue these two examples whereby the *Apostle* hath proued sufficiently, that the faith which is separated frō obedience, will not iustifie a man, & therefore that it is a dead faith, and not a true liuing faith according as was propo sed, v.20. Now for a close of this whole dispute he againe repeats that conclusion, adding thereto a new similitude to illustrate it by in the last verse of the chapter. *For as the body without the spirit is dead so faith without workes is dead*, that is, *As the body without the spirit*, i.e. the *Soule*, or the *Breath* and other *Motion (is dead) vnable* to performe any liuing action whatsoeuer: *So faith without workes is dead*; that is, vtterly vnable to performe these liuing actions, which belong

belong vnto it. What are those? Two. 1. To repose it stedfastly vpon the promise of life in *Christ*, which is the proper immediate liuing Action of faith. 2. To iustifie a Man in the sight of God, which by a speciall priuiledge is the *consequent* of the former. These liuing actions cannot be performed by that *Faith* which is dead, being destitute of good workes. That *faith* which hath not power to bring forth obedience, is thereby declared to be a dead faith, deuoide of all power to embrace the promise with confidence & relyance as also to iustifie. A man would thinke this were plaine enough, & needed not to be troubled with any further Cauillations. But 'tis strange what a coile our aduersaries make with this similitude, writhing and straining it to such conclusions as the *Apostle* neuer intended. Hence they gather. 1. That as the soule giues life to the body, as the forme of the body: so workes giue life to *Faith*, as the forme of it. 2 That as the body is the same true Body without the soule and with it: so *Faith* is one and the same true faith without workes and with them, which are nothing but *sophisticall speculations* besides the purpose of the text. The Apostle intends nothing but to shew the *necessity* of the *Copulation* of a liuing faith and obedience together: by the similitude of the like necessity of the vnion of a liuing body, and the Soule. But his purpose is not to shew, that the manner of their *Connexion* is the same, that iust in euery point as the soule is to the Body, or the body to the Soule: so workes are vnto faith, and faith vnto workes. It sufficeth to his intent, that as in the absence of the soule, the body: so in the absence of obedience, faith is dead. But thence it followes not, that workes by their presence doe the same thing to *Faith*, as the Soule to the body by its presence; or that faith in the absence of workes remaines the same; as the body

doth in the absence of the soule. If wee must needs bee tied to the strict termes of the Similitude: let vs a little examine the comparison, and we shall see our aduersaries all fly off first from it. Let the comparison be first thus. Betweene the Body and the soule, Faith and Workes as the termes bee in the Text.

As the Body without the soule is dead: because the soule giues life. i.e. sense, breathing, and all other motion to the body.

So faith without workes is dead, because workes giue life vnto faith.

But now this comparison will not runne on all foure. For *Workes* are not vnto *Faith* as the *Soule* is to the body; but as sense and motion is to the body. Seeing Workes are externall acts, not internall habits: and so are proportionable not to the *soule*, but to the liuing actions thence issuing. Wherefore 'tis as absurd to say, that workes giue life vnto *faith*, as 'tis ridiculous to affirme, that *Sense* and *Motion* giue life to the body, which are not causes; but effects and signes of life. Therefore when faith without workes is dead, 'tis not spoken in that sense, because *workes* giue life to Faith, as the *Soule* doth to the Body. Let then the comparison bee thus. Betweene the body and the Soule. Faith and Charity.

As the body without the Soule is dead, because the Soule is the forme of the body, and giues life to it.

So faith without Charity is dead, because Charity is the Forme of Faith, and giues life to it.

But neither will the comparison hold vpon these termes. For 1. our Aduersaries here put in *Charity* the habit, for *workes* the act: which is more then themselues ought to doe, seeing they will tie vs at short bitts, to the very letter of the Text. For though we can bee content to admit that inter-

interpretation, would they admit of the *Apostles* plaine meaning, and not straine for *querkes:* yet seeing they argue so precisely from the words of the comparison, they must not now haue liberty from vs to goe from them, but bee content to take the words as they lie in the text; and make their best of them. Yet seeing 'tis most senseleſſe to make Workes (that is) externall Actions the forme of faith an internall habit: let them take *Charity* insteed of them, an internall habit likewise. Will it be any better now? belike so. Then 'tis thus. *As the soule is the forme of the body: so charity is the forme of faith, and as the soule giues life and action to the body, so charity vnto Faith.* Will they stand to this? No. Here againe they fly off in both *Comparisons*. Charity is one habit, Faith another distinct betweene themselues, and therefore they deny, as there's good reason, that *Charity* is either the *Essentiall forme* of faith, as the soule of the liuing body: or the *accidentall forme*, as whitnesse of *Paper*. They say 'tis only an *externall forme*. But this now is not to keepe close to the *Apostles* comparison, but to runne from it at their pleasure, when they fall vpon an absurdity in pressing of it so strictly. *The Soule is no externall, but an internall Essentiall Forme, and therefore Charity must be so, if all runne round.* Againe doth *Charitie* giue life or liuing actions vnto faith as the soule doth vnto the Body? Neither dare they hold close to this comparison. For the proper worke or action of faith is to assent vnto the truth of diuine reuelations, because of Gods authority as themselues teach. Whence now comes this assent? From the *Habit* of *Faith*, or of *Charity*? They grant that it comes immediatlie from the *Habit* of *Faith*, which produceth this action, euen when its seuered from *Charity*. Then 'tis plaine that it is not *Charity* that giues life to faith, which can performe the proper

per action that belongs to it, without its helpe. How then doth *Charity* giue life vnto *Faith*? For this, they haue a silly conceit. *Charity giues life*, that is *Merite* vnto *Faith*. The beleefe, or assent vnto diuine truth is *meritorious* if it be with *Charity*. If without, then 'tis not meritorious. This is a fine toy, wherein againe they runne quite from the *comparison* of the *Apostle*. For the *Soule* giues liuing actions to the Body, not only the *qualifications* of the actions: and so *Charity* is not like the soule, because it giues only the *qualification* of *Merit* vnto the action of Faith, and not the action it selfe. Beside. A most vaine interpretation it is, without any ground from Scripture, to say a liuing faith, (that is) *a meritorious faith*: when euen in common sense, the life of any habit consists onely in a power to produce those actions, that naturallie and immediatlie depend vpon that *Habit*. And what Reason is there in the world why the *Habit* of *Charity* should make the actions of *Faith meritorious*, or why *Charity* should make *Faith meritorious*, rather then *Faith* make *Charity meritorious*, seing in this life there is no such præeminency of *Charity* aboue *faith*? Wherefore wee despise these *Speculatiue sophismes*, which with much faire glozing, our aduersaries draw from the text: but yet when all comes to the triall, themselues will not stand to the strict application of the *similitude*, because it breeds absurdities, which euen themselues abhorre. Now if they take liberty to *qualifie* and *interpret*, they must giue vs leaue to doe so too, or if they will not wee shall take it. To shut vp all. Their other collection is as weake as the former: namely. *A dead body is a true body, ergo a dead faith is true faith.* This argument forceth the Similitude, and so is of a force. In materiall things which haue a diuerse being from different *Causes*, it may hold. But 'tis not so in vertues

and

and Graces. Truth and life are both *essentiall* to such *qualities*. True *Charity* is a liuing *Charity* (i. e.) actiue, as the *Apostle* himselfe proues. vers. 15. True Valour, and so of euery vertuous *quality*, if it be true, 'tis liuing and stirring in action: if it be otherwise, 'tis counterfeit, some other thing that hath only a shadow of it. All these tricks are put vpon the *Apostle* to peruert his plaine meaning: viz. That as it is necessary to the being of a liuing body that it bee coupled with the soule, so 'tis necessary to the being of a liuing true Christian *Faith*, that it bring forth *Workes* of *Obedience*.

SECT. 7. CHAP. I.

None can be iustified by their owne satisfaction for the transgression of the Law. A briefe summe of Popish doctrine, concerning humane satisfactions for sinne.

THus wee haue a resolution of the dispute of S. *Iames*, together with such Cauils, as our Aduersaries make vpon the seuerall passages thereof. By the whole order whereof it appeares sufficiently that S. *Iames* disputing against *Faith*, meanes thereby that false and bastard faith which *Hypocrites* pleased themselues withall instead of a true faith: and that disputing for workes, he meanes nothing but a working *Faith*. And it appeares also that the drift of the *Apostle* is not in this place to dispute directly of mans *Iustification*: but only to bring that in, as an argument to proue his principall Conclusion. *That faith without workes is dead, because it will not iustifie*. In some it's euident, that neither these *Apostles* doe disagree betweene themselues, nor yet either of them doe agree with our aduersaries in teaching *Iustification* by

the Workes of the Morall law. Of the impossibility of mans Iustification by which meanes, *Hitherto.*

2 Conclusion proued.

The next *Proposition* is, that [*None can bee iustified by their owne satisfaction for the transgression of the Law.*] For this is the only way left for an offender to obtaine *iustification* and *Absolution:* viz: to alleadge that he hath satisfied for his offence committed; by doing or suffering so much as the party offended could in iustice exact of him. Which satisfaction being made, he is no longer debter vnto him, but deserues his absolution and his fauour, as if hee had not offended at all. Now then the *Question* is. *Whether a sinner may, by any thing done, or endured by himselfe, satisfie the iustice of God, and so obtaine absolution at the barre of Gods Iudgement.* Wee defend the negatiue. That it is impossible for a sinner, by any Action or passion of his owne to doe so much as shall be equiualent vnto the wrong which hee hath done vnto the glorious iustice of God: that therewith he may rest satisfied and exact no farther penalty. Which point is so euident vnto the Conscience of euery one that knowes himselfe to be, either a *Creature*, or a *Man*, or a *Sinner*; that it needs not any confirmation. If wee be considered as *Creatures*, ther's nothing that a finite strength in a finite time can performe, which can hold proportion with the offence of an infinite goodnesse and iustice, and the eternall punishment thereby deserued. Consider vs as men, so we are bound to fulfill the Law of God in all perfection, nor is there any thing so true, so honest, so iust, so pure, so worthy loue and good report: but the Law one way or other obliges vs vnto the thought and practise of it. So that besides our due debt of obedience, wee haue nothing to spare ouer and aboue, whereby to satisfie God for those Trespasses that wee haue committed vpon his *honour* and

Phil. 4. 8.
Deut. 5. 6.

iustice

iustice. Lastly consider vs as *Sinners*, so wee are tyed in a double obligation, 1 of punishment to be suffered for *sinne* committed. 2. Another of obedience to bee perpetually performed. Both these debts of punishment and obedience, are equally exacted of sinfull men, and *ergo* 'tis as absurd in diuinity to say, the obedience of the law or good workes will satisfie for the transgression of the law: as 'tis in ciuill dealing to accompt the payment of one band the discharge also of another. Wherefore euery one that is not blinde & proud in heart will here be soone perswaded to relinquish all claime of heauen by his owne satisfaction, running vnto him only, who alone without the helpe of man or *Angell hath trodden the Winepresse of the fiercenesse of Gods wrath, bearing our sinnes in his body on the tree, suffering the vtmost, whatsoeuer was due to the punishment of them.* Our aduersaries in this businesse are at a stand, mistrusting their owne, yet not daring wholy to trust to *Christs* satisfactions. They will giue him leaue to haue his part; but, by his leaue, they will haue one share too in satisfying for sinnes. For they are a generation of men that are resolued to be as little beholding to God, as may be, for grace, or for glory. And if there be any article of religion wherein scripture and Reason would giue the honour of all vnto God, they looke at it with an euill eye, and cast about which way to thrust in themselues for copartners. 'Tis strange to see to what passe Pride and couetousnesse haue brought the doctrine of Satisfaction, as it is now taught and practised in the *Romish Church*. With your patience I shall take a short suruaie of it, that you may see whether of vs twaine rest our consciences vpon the surer and more stedfast *anchor*: wee that trust only to *Christs* satisfactions; or they that ioine their owne together with his.

The summe of their doctrine, as it is deliuered vnto vs by the *Councell* of *Trent*. *Sess*.6. *cap*. 14. 16. *&* *Sess*.14. *cap*.8.9. with the *Romish Catechisme part*.2. *chap*.5. *quest*.52. *&seq*. and explained at large by *Bellarmine* in his two bookes *De Purgatorio* in his 4th booke *De Pœnitentia*, and his bookes *De Indulgentiis*: is this. *Sinnes are of two sorts.*

1 *Sinne committed before Baptisme: as Originall Sinne in all that are baptized infants: and actuall sinnes in those that are baptised at yeares of discretion.*

2 *Sinne committed after baptisme: when after the grace of the holy Ghost receiued in Baptisme, men fall into sin, polluting the Temple of God, and grieuing his Spirit.*

Touching the former sort of Sinnes, they are agreed that men are freed from them both the fault and punishment, by the merits and satisfaction of *Christ* only, without any satisfaction on our part. But now for sinnes after Baptisme, in the obtaining of Remission of them, *Christ* & we part stakes. Which *copartnership* is declared vnto vs in this manner. *In these sinnes* (wee must know) *there are three things considerable.*

1 *The fault in the offence of Gods Maiesty, and violation of our friendship with him.* Here they grant also, that man cannot satisfie for the fault, doing any thing that may appease Gods displeasure; and procure his loue. *Christ* only hath done this for vs, for whose only satisfaction, God of his mercy freely returnes into fauour and friendship with vs. But this must be vnderstood in a *Catholique* sense, viz: for fault of *Mortall sinnes*; as for *Veniall sinnes* God is but sleightly angry with them, and so wee may satisfie him for fault thereof, both in this life, and in *Purgatory*.

2 *The staine or corruption of sinne, called the reliques of Sin abiding in the soule. For the purging out of which, there*

there is great force in such satisfactions, as are made by Prayers, Fastings, Almes deeds, and other laborious workes, although the Heretiques say otherwise. That the abolishing of inherent corruption is by the gift of grace freely bestowed on vs by degrees, in the vse of all godly meanes.

3 *The punishment of sinne, which after the fault is pardoned, remaines yet to be suffered. For although it bee true that God in some cases doth pardon both fault and punishment wholy, as in case of Martyrdome, which sweeps all cleane, and makes all reckonings euen, and although God might, if it had so pleased him, alwaies for Christ's sake haue pardoned the whole debt: yet Holy Mother Church hath determined, that hee doth not so vse to doe. But after that in mercy hee hath forgiuen the fault: yet there's an after reckoning, and wee must come to coram for that punishment, by which his iustice is to receaue satisfaction. But (*yee must knowe*) the punishment of sinnes is twofold.*

1 *Eternall, is the destruction of soule & body in Hell fire to endure for euer.*

Heere now *Christ's* satisfaction comes in againe. By whose merits alone they grant, wee are deliuered from the *eternity* of the *punishment of sinne.* Which must be noted, that Christs satisfaction hath not eased vs of the substance of the punishment it selfe: but only in the continuance of it.

2 *Temporall, to endure only for a time, whereof there are also two degrees.*

1 *One in this life, as namely all calamities and afflictions vpon the Body, Soule, Name, Goods, &c. together with death the last and greatest of euills. All which are inflicted vpon man, as punishments of Sinne.* Of

these some come vpon vs ineuitably, as death vpon all men, or as death in the wildernesse on the children of *Israel*, with the like punishments, certainely & irreuocably denounced. Now here's no remedy but patience, and that's an excellent remedy too. For (as the ghostly Fathers of *Trent* informe vs) *If they be borne willingly with patience, they be satisfactions for sinnes: but if vnwillingly, they bee God's iust reuenge vpon vs.* Other some come, *Euitably. And here such a course may be taken, that wee need not suffer the punishment it selfe: but we may buy it out and make satisfaction for it vnto God by other meanes.* Which meanes are principally foure.

1 *By the vehemency of contrition, or inward sorrowe. Which may be so intensiue as to satisfie for all punishments, both in this life and also in Purgatory.*

2 *By other outward laborious workes. Whereby we may buy out the obligation to temporall punishments. Such workes are these.*

1 *Prayer with confession, Thanksgiuing, &c.* For, if we beleeue the *Catholique* Doctors 'tis a very good satisfaction to a Creditour, if the debter pray vnto him for the forgiuenesse of his debt. According to that Text. *Psalme* 50.15: *Call vpon mee in the day of trouble and I will deliuer thee. Ergo, Prayer* is a satisfaction for the punishment of sinne.

2 *Fasting, vnder which is comprehended the sprinkling of Ashes, wearing of haire cloth, whippings, going bare foot, and such other penall workes.* These also satisfie for sinnes as 'tis written 2.*Sam.*12. *Dauid fasted, lay vpon the ground and wept all night.* Therefore he satisfied for his sinnes of murther and adultery. And againe, *Paul* saith, 1.*Cor.*9.27. *I beat downe my body.* That is, I whip and cudgell my selfe to satisfie

tisfie for my sinnes. And againe, *Luke*, 18.13. *The Publican smote vpon his breast, Ergo.* corporall chastisement is a good satisfaction for sinnes.

3 *Almesdeeds: comprehending all kinde whatsoeuer workes of mercy.* These also buy out the punishments of sinne according to the Text, *Dan.*4.24. *Breake off thy sinne by righteousnesse, and thine iniquity by mercy towards the poore.* That is. By *Almesdeeds* satisfie for the temporall punishments of thy sinnes. And againe. *Luke* 11.41. *Giue almes of that which you haue, and behold all things shall be cleane vnto you.* That is to say (in the language of *Babell*) The temporall punishment of sinne shall bee taken away. Now all such workes as these are either.

1 *Voluntarily vndertaken of our owne accord, as voluntary Pilgrimage, Scourgings, Fasts, Sackcloth, Weepings and Prayers of such a number and measure, with the like rough punishments, which wee take vpon our selues to pacifie God. All which being done with an intent to satisfie for the punishment of our sinnes; must needs bee accepted of God Almighty for good payment: because in so doing, wee doe more then hee hath required of our hands.*

Now 'tis very pleasing to God to doe what hee bids vs not: or what he bids vs, to doe to another end of our devising. Hee therefore that voluntarily vndertakes such needlesse paines, giues God high *satisfaction.* According to the Text, 1.*Cor.*11.31. *If we would iudge our selues, we should not be iudged.*

2 *Inioyned by the Priest.* Who by *vertue of the Keyes committed vnto him* might iudicially absolue the penitent from the whole debt, were it not *thought fit vpon speciall considerations* to keepe back a part. Wherefore when hee hath

hath absolued him from the *fault and eternall punishment*, he bindes him vnto satisfaction for *the temporall punishment* and therefore he enioynes him what hee shall doe to buy it out. Let him goe visit the shrine of such and such a Saint, say so many *Aues* and *Paternosters* before such an Image, whip himselfe so many times, fast so many daies, giue so much almes with such like penalties. And when he in humble obedience hath done these things commanded by the *Priest*: then 'tis certaine his sinnes be satisfied for. For 'tis to be noted that in enioyning this *Canonicall satisfaction*, as 'tis called, the *Priest* and *God* Almighty be iust of the same minde. Looke how much the *Priest* enioines for *satisfaction*, God must be content to take the same, or else the *penitent's* conscience will not be quiet, because it may bee, God expected more to be done for *satisfaction*: then the party hath done by the *Priests* iniunction. But it is to bee supposed, that as the *Pope*, so euery *Priest* in his *Chaire of confession*, hath an infallible spirit, whereby hee is able exactly to calculate the iust proportion betweene the sinne and the punishment, & the price of the punishment, that so he may enioyne iust so much pennance, as will buy it out; neither more lest the penitent be wronged: nor lesse, lest God be not satisfied. All which is trimly founded vpon that Text which saith. *whatsoeuer yee binde on earth shall be bound in heauen, and whatsoeuer yee loose on earth shall be loosed in heauen. Mat.* 16. 19. and 18. 18. That is, *Priests may forgiue the fault and retaine the punishment, and what satisfaction they enioyne on earth to expiate the punishment, that will God accept in heauen.* Or else they be deceaued. This is the second meanes to satisfie for temporall punishments.

The 3. *Meanes is by Pardons and Indulgences.* Wherein *the superabundant merits of Christ and the Saints are*

out

out of the treasury of the Church graunted by speciall grace of the Bp. of Rome vnto such as are liable to suffer the temporall punishment of their sinnes. So that they hauing got by his grant a sufficient portion of satisfactory workes, out of the common stocke, they are freed thereby from satisfying Gods iustice, by their own workes. Which is a rare priuiledge no doubt.

4 *The fourth meanes is by another liuing mans satisfaction for them.* For not only the superabundant workes of *Christ* and *Saints* departed: but the good workes of iust men aliue will satisfie for another, being done with that intent. So great is Gods clemency towards good *Catholiques*, that, though one man cannot *confesse, nor be contrite for another*; yet satisfie he may the *Iustice* of *God* for his *sinnes*. Both these meanes are grounded vpon pregnant places of Scripture. *Gal.6.2. Beare yee one anothers burthen*, that is, satisfie one for another. Againe 2 *Cor.12.15. I will most gladly bestowe and be bestowed for your sake*: that is, *to satisfie for your sinnes*. Againe. 2. *Tim.2.10. I suffer all things for the Elects sake*: that is, *that my sufferings may be their satisfactions*. So *Col.1.24. I reioice in my sufferings for you, and fulfill the rest of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his bodies sake, which is the Church*. That is. *My sufferings with Christs sufferings make vp a treasurie for the Church, that such as want of their owne, may make vse of his satisfaction and mine*, Againe *Rom.12.15. Wee being many are one anothers Members. Ergo, Wee may impart satisfactory workes one to another, as one member doth heat to another*. To conclude. 'Tis in our *Creed. I beleeue a communion of Saints. Ergo There is a communion of satisfactions*. And so the point is very fitly proued. Whereby it appeares that the *Children* of the *Romish Church* are reasonable well prouided of

meanes to recompence Gods *Iustice*, and redeeme the Temporall punishment of their sinnes in this life.

The other degree of the *temporall punishment* is in the *life to come*, namely, in *purgatory*, whereinto all they drop who die in *Venial Sinne*, the fault whereof was not forgiuen in this Life; or in *Mortall Sinnes*, the fault whereof was forgiuen in this life; but full satisfaction was not made for the punishment before death. Such must fry a while in *Purgatory* longer or shorter time according as their Sinnes are more or lesse haynous; or as mens hearts on earth bee more or lesse pittifull towards them. But howeuer there they must be till the *Temporall punishmeut* of their *Sinnes* be fully suffered: or bought out by something else that may satisfie Gods iustice.

This *Punishment* of sinne inflicted in *Purgatory*, is twofold.

1 *Pœna Damni. of Losse (viz.) of the beautifull visions of God, and ioyes of Heauen.*

2 *Pœna sensus. of sense or smart. viz. The bitter paines of God's wrath sensibly tormenting the Powers of the Soule, inflicted vpon them either immediatly by God himselfe, or by the ministery of the diuels as his Instruments.*

For 'tis a doubt not yet resolued among the *Patrons* of *Purgatory*, whether the Diuells haue not to doe there also as well as in hell. But whether their tormentours bee diuells or not, this is agreed vpon, that the torment and punishment which the soules doe suffer in Purgatory, is for the substance of it the very same with the torments of Hell, differing only from it in continuance, those of *Purgatoy be temporall*, these of *Hell eternall*. Well now, such as haue not bestirred themselues then well in this life to make all euen by full *satisfactions*, such must be arrested in the mid way to Heauen, and

and cast into this *Prison*. Out of which two meanes there be to be deliuered.

1 *By suffering all this temporall punishment for so many yeares and dayes as tis to continue.* How many, that is, you must inquire of St *Michael*, the *Church* knowes not that. But yet sure she is, that many *Soules* shall continue in *Purgatory* till the day of *Iudgement*, so there shall be the same period of the world, and of their torments. These haue a hard time of it; 'tis easier happily with others. But be it as 'twill be, such as these pay the vtmost farthing, where they endure in the flames of *Purgatory*, so long till the time of their whole punishment be runne out. Then God is satisfied and they deliuered.

2 *By buying out this punishment by some other satisfactory price.* For although God could so haue ordered it, that euery Soule being once in purgatory, should suffer all the Temporall punishments due: yet; he is content to bee intreated to commute *penance*, and take some other valueable consideration by way of *satisfaction* for this punishment. But this *satisfactory* payment cannot be made by the soules themselues: it must bee made by some on earth for them. which is done. 1 Either by laborious workes of any one iust and godly *Catholique*, whether he be a friend of the deceased, or other touched with a charitable pitty toward a poore soule. Who by store of deuout prayers, Almes, Masses, Pilgrimages, founding of Couents and Hospitals, &c. may procure a *gaole-delinery* for that soule for which hee intends those good workes. 2 Or by the *Pope* who is purse-bearer to the *Church*, and hath the treasurie thereof vnder locke and key. He now, though he cannot directly absolue the *soules* in Purgatory from their punishment, as he can men liuing on the earth, yet hee may helpe them another

way by bestowing on them so much of the superfluous sufferings of Christ & of the Saints, that thereby Gods Iustice may bee satisfied, for the whole punishment, which otherwise they should haue endured. Yea such is the power of his *Indulgences* to infuse a vertue into such and such Altars, Shrines, Praiers, &c. that whosoeuer shall frequent such places or vse such prayers, all complements duly obserued: he may at his pleasure free 1.2.3. or more soules out of *Purgatory*. Nay did not couetousnes coole the heat of his *Apostolicall Charity*, he might so bountifully powre out the Treasures of the Church vpon these Prisoners in *Purgatory*, that they should all haue enough to weigh downe the scales, and deserue a *passe-port* for *Heauen*. Such efficacie there is in that *Spirituall pick-locke* which the *Pope* hath in keeping. All which is very properly proued by the former places of Scripture, and others also, were it needfull now to alleadge them. But thus we see the *Catholiques* are every way furnished for *satisfactions*, that what *Christ* hath not done for them, they can doe for themselues, either to suffer and ouercome the *Temporall punishments* of their Sinnes, or else, which is the easier course, to buy out that punishment at a valuable price of other *satisfactionary* workes, wherewith Gods iustice shall be abundantly contented. Now whereas those whom they terme *Heritiques*, cry out aloud that such *satisfactions* to God's iustice bee indeed no *Satisfactions* at all, because they are no waies equall vnto the *offence committed*: and so no full recompence of wrong offered vnto God: for the assoiling of this doubt, they giue vs this distinction very necessary to be obserued. Satisfaction is double.

1 *Iustitiæ: ex rigore Iustitiæ, ad absolutam & perfectam Æqualitatem Quantitatis.* That is, *There is a satisfaction of Iustice consisting in a perfect equality betweene the*

the offence and wrong, and the recompence made, when so much is done, or suffered, as the offended party can in iustice exact. Now they grant that man cannot satisfie God in this sort in rigour of Iustice. Only Christ hath satisfied so; for vnto such a satisfaction it is required that it be done.

1 *Ex propriis. By that which is our owne.*

2 *Ex indebitis. By that which is not debt of it selfe.*

3 *Ad æqualitatem. By that which is of equall worth and value.* Now none of these waies can our satisfaction passe in strict iustice. Because whatsoeuer wee haue, 'tis Gods free gift: whatsoeuer wee can doe, 'tis our due obedience, and when we haue done all, yet wee cannot by any finite act doe such honour to God, as shall bee equall to that iniury wee haue offered to his infinite *Maiestie*. Euen the right of Nature teacheth, as *Bellarmine* grants, that man cannot *paria reddere Deo*, giue him *quid pro quo*.

2 *Acceptationis facti ex gratiâ donante ad imperfectam Æqualitatem proportionis & ex condigno*, i. e. *There is a satisfaction of fauourable acceptance, wherein there is a kinde of imperfect proportion betweene the offence and the recompence, when so much is done or suffered, as God is content in gentlenesse to take for good satisfaction.* Thus then a man may satisfie Gods iustice, because God giues him grace to doe so much as hee will accept for satisfaction. Which Grace is threefold.

1 *The Grace of Iustification, whereby the holy Ghost dwels in vs, and wee are made members of Christ, and Christ is become our Head. By meanes of which vnion with Christ, and inhabitation of the Spirit, it comes to passe that our workes haue a singular vertue. For Christ communicates vnto vs his satisfaction, and by merits of*

them, makes our workes meritorious and satisfactorie vnto God.

So that whereas all things whatsoeuer wee could haue done, were of no worth at all in the sight of God: now Christ hath deserued such a grace for vs that the *spotted ragges* of our righteousnesse and good workes being *tincta Christi sanguine* (i. e.) died in the bloud of Christ receaue such a colour, that they will passe for reasonable good cloth. In a word, our money is now good siluer which before was but brasse. Againe, because the *holy Ghost* dwels in the iust, *Ergo* (as *Bellarmine* profoundly argues) *their workes proceeding from the holy Ghost haue* [*quandam infinitatem*] *a kind of infinitnesse in them, and thereby, quandam æqualitatem, a kinde of equality with the iniury which by sinning we offered vnto God.* Euen as a man may say, that a Fly or a Spider is a kinde of infinite *Creature* because 'tis of Gods making: & God yee knowe is infinite. This is the first Grace of *Iustification.* The second yee may call.

2 *The Grace of Euangelicall Counsailes.* For although God might of right challenge all our workes as due vnto him: yet so it is that he commands not all, but only perswads and exhorts vnto some. By which bounty of God, it comes to passe that wee haue certaine workes *Propria & indebita, of our owne which we owe him not, and by these we only make satisfaction.* Yea such is the bounty of God, that *hee suffers vs to merit by those things which be of his free gift, and is willingly content that what we receaue at his hand, we giue it him backe againe for a satisfactory payment to his iustice.* Which is very strange I tell you.

3 *Lastly one grace more God giues vs. Namely. When hee pardons the fault he remoues the eternity of the punishment, and makes it temporall, that so it may be more ea-*

sily

fily satisfied for. All which particulars and *Priuileges* are sure and certaine, because the *Catholique* Doctors haue firmely proued them out of their owne heads without the helpe of the *Scripture.* So then they are agreed. That our workes are not *satisfactorie in rigour of iustice*: but only in fauourable acceptance, by grace giuen to doe them, & Gods clemency in accepting them being done.

CHAP. II.

All sinne is remitted vnto vs wholy in the fault and punishment. For the onely satisfaction of Iesus Christ.

THus I haue somewhat largely set forth vnto you the *Popish Doctrine* of *humane* satisfaction for sinne, wherein it is plaine to all that can see any thing, that their aime hath beene to lay a plot to delude mens soules & picke their *Purses.* It would require a large discourse to prosecute their Arguments, whereby they seeke to couer their fraud. But they are not of that moment, as to spend time about them, being to hasten to other matters. The summe of them all comes vnto this. 1. That those afflictions and temporall chastisements which God hath laid vpon his Children (for the Triall of their faith and patience, for their humiliation for sinnes past by hearty repentance, for their admonition for the time to come, for the example of others. &c.) they must needs bee, in these mens Imaginations, true *satisfactions* to Gods Iustice to expiate their sinnes past. 2. That such good workes as the godly haue performed for declaration of their *piety*; testification of their thankfulnesse vnto *God*; for to expresse the sorrow of heart; for to bring them-

selues to a greater measure of true humiliation by much *Prayer, Fasting, &c.* for to obtaine victory ouer some corruption, and temptation; for to get some grace which they wanted; for to preuent or fit themselues for some iudgement feared; &c. All this now must be conceiued presently to be meritorious and satisfactorie to Gods iustice for Sin.

3 That such pennance, as in the *Primitiue Church* was enioyned vnto those that after their *Conversion* and *Baptisme*, relapsed againe to *Heathenisme*; or otherwise for such as for scandalous offences were excommunicated: I say that such Pennance enioyned to these for testification of their hearty sorrow for their offence, and for satisfaction to the *Congregation*, before they might be againe admitted into it: must now bee turned into a direct and proper satisfaction for the sinne it selfe.

4 That such indulgence or fauour as was then sometimes vsed toward such relapsed and excommunicate persons (in remitting vnto them some part of their enioyned *Pennance* vpon euident tokens of their vnfained repentance) this is now by these men turned quite to another vse. Namely, to the freeing of men from further satisfaction to Gods Iustice by applying vnto them certaine *phantasticall supererogations treasured vp in the Popes Cabinet.* These are the maine issues and errors of their disputes, wherein I will proceed no farther. but only lay downe one generall conclusion opposite vnto their doctrine, and so end this point with a few reasons, for the confirmation of the truth and confutation of this error. The Position is this.

All sinne whatsoeuer, Originall or Actuall is remitted vnto vs wholy in the fault and punishment, as well Temporall as Æternall for the only satisfaction of Iesus Christ; & not any satisfaction made by vs vnto the iustice of God.

For

For confirmation of this sacred truth deliuered vnto vs in the word and generally embraced by the *Reformed Churches* (yea by our aduersaries themselues when the *Agonies of Conscience*, the *apprehension of Death & Gods Iudgement* doe cleere vp their eyes, a little to behold the *vanity* of their poore *satisfaction*) obserue wee these Reasons.

First the innumerable testimonies of Scripture ascribing the remission of *Sinne*, only to the *mercy* of *God in Christ* crucified. *That Christ hath borne* [a] *our sinnes; His blood hath purged* [b] *vs of all sinne; His death* [c] *redeemed vs from all iniquity; his* [d] *stripes healed vs; that he hath* [e] *paid the ἀντίλυτρον or price of our Ransome; That God for his* [f] *sake hath forgiuen vs our trespasses; Blotted out* [g] *our sinnes; Cast them* [h] *behind his backe; Forgotten* [i] *them*; with store of the like sayings, ascribing the doeing away of all sinnes to the *Grace* of *God* through the *Satisfaction of Christ* without limiting it to any Sinne, or mentioning any *satisfactorie workes* of ours. Now what say our aduersaries to this? By a shift they turne of all *Scriptures* tending to this purpose. Thus *Christ hath satisfied for the fault of our sinnes; and so reconciled vs vnto God, and for the eternity of the punishment: but hee satisfied not for temporall punishment: Wee must endure torments though but for a while.* This is a meere *Cavill* without any apparant ground from such texts of Scripture; or necessary deduction from other. Wee deny it therefore as they affirme it. And that it may appeare to be but a forged diuice: Let vs inuert the distinction and we shall holde it with as good probability the other way. *Christ satisfied for the fault, not for the punishments* (say they.) Wee will goe contrary and say, *Christ satisfied for the punishment: but not for the fault. Wee by our owne satisfaction must procure Gods fauour.* Now let them obiect what they can against this: if wee lust to ca-

a 1. Pet. 2. 24.
b Heb. 1. 3.
c Tit. 2. 24.
d Isa. 53. 5.
1 Pet. 2. 24.
e 1. Tim. 2. 6.
f Col. 2. 13.
g Ibid. v. 14.
h Isa. 38. 7.
i Ier. 31. 34.

vill as they doe: it may be shifted off with as faire probabilitie; as they doe our arguments on the other part. Let them name all the places that say, *Christ hath* [k] *reconciled vs vnto God his father.* This is easily put off. *Christ hath reconciled vs.* That is *Christ deserued such grace for vs: that wee by our workes may reconcile our selues.* Iust as they say. *Christ hath satisfied*, that is: *procured grace for vs: that wee by our workes might satisfie.* Let them obiect, *Our workes can bee of no worth to appease Gods anger.* Wee will say. True. Of themselues they are not, but Christ hath merited that they should be of sufficient worth. Iust as themselues say vnto vs obiecting, that our workes be not of value to satisfie Gods Iustice. True say they. Of themselues they be not: but *Christ* hath deserued for them to make them *satisfactorious.* Thus if euery idle distinction not fortified by necessary deduction from Scripture might passe for a good answere, the certainty of Diuine Doctrine were soone shaken to pieces: and no *Position* so absurd, but would bee defended with much facility.

k Coll.1.20.

2 That assertion of theirs. Namely. *That the fault is forgiuen and the punishment required,* is most false and absurd; euen in common sense. To pardon a fault & be friends and yet require full satisfaction; to forgiue the debt, yet to exact the payment, be not these trimme kindnesses? [a] Bellarmine tells vs, there be some offences of so grieuous Nature: that satisfaction cannot bee made, but in a long time. Now in this case the party wronged may pardon the other, & be reconciled to him: yet the offender remaine still bound to make entire satisfaction for the wrong. But now the *Iesuite* doth not name any such case: neither indeed can doe. For suppose a subiect hath offended his Prince and the fault deserued 7 yeares close imprisonment for satisfaction. If the

a Bell. de pœn. lib.4.cap.1.

Prince

Prince should say vnto him I pardon your offence, you haue my loue; but yet you shall lie by it to the last daie: were it not a mockerie, would any man thanke him for such a kindnesse? It is to be thought the *Iesuites*, the incendiaries of Christendome would not thanke Christian princes for such a curtesie, if they should pardon them their fault, and hang them vp. The like absurditie there is in this, when they say; That after the fault pardoned; yet in this life and in *Purgatory*, the temporall punishment must be suffered. For wherfore must it be suffered? *For satisfaction* say they, to what? To Gods Iustice. For what now? Is it for the fault and offence committed? No, That's pardoned. For what then? For iust nothing.

Againe, this assertion is contrary to good reason. For God's *Friendship*, and his *Iustice* may not be diuided in this sort, as if he were reconciled and well pleased with that creature, which hath violated his iustice, and not made satisfaction for it. Gods friendship with man followes *satisfaction* to his *Iustice:* euen as his enmity with man is a consequent of the breach of his iustice. His righteous will is transgressed, therefore he is offended. His righteous will must bee satisfied before he be pleased. So that it is a vaine *speculation* to thinke. *(Christ hath appeased Gods anger, but not satisfied his iustice, for asmuch as his fauour is purchased onely by satisfaction to his iustice offended.*

3 This doctrine of *humane satisfactions*, obscures the dignity, & ouerthrowes the Force of Christ's *satisfactions*. If wee haue a share, he hath not all the glory. Nay, hee hath scarce any at all. For aske wee. For what hath *Christ* satisfied? They say, to procure God's Loue to vs. But that cannot be, vnlesse he hath satisfied his iustice. Hath he done this, or no? Yes, he hath satisfied for the Æternity of the punish-

ment. Yea. But how know they that? What if wee vpon their grounds say, that he hath not satisfied for the eternity of it: but only merited, that our sufferings and satisfactions should be equiualent to the eternity of the *punishment?* Especially considering that our workes according to *Bellarmine, haue a certaine kinde of infinite value* in them. Againe, eternity is but an accident of punishment of Sinne: the *Essentialls* of it are the losse of ioy, & the sense of paine: if therefore *Christ* haue satisfied only for that, he hath done but the least part. Neuertheless our aduersaries will needs perswade vs, that *humane satisfactions* doe not so much *eclipse* as *illustrate* the glory of *Christs satisfactions*: in as much as thereby hee hath not only satisfied himselfe: but made vs able also to satisfie. A great matter doubtlesse. But where saith the Scripture any such matter, that *Christ* hath merited that wee might merit and satisfie. And moreouer by this tricke, whilest *Christ* makes vs able to merit and satisfie: his owne satisfaction is plainely excluded. For come to the point, and aske. Who is it satisfies God's iustice for Sin? Christ, or wee? Here [b] *Bellarmine* stumbles like a blinde horse, and of three answeres takes the very worst. Some say 'tis *Christ*, and he only *satisfies properly*: but we *Improperly*. Our workes being only a condition without which *Christs satisfaction* is not applied vnto vs. But such smell of the *fagot*. For 'tis a perilous *Haresie* to say, *Christ only satisfies for Sinnes*. Well others say, that both *Christ and wee our selues* doe satisfie, and also ther's two satisfactions for the same offence. But this mettall clinketh not well neither. Wherefore others are of opinion, & *Bellarmine* likes it. That *we only satisfie, not Christ. Tertius tamen modus probabilior videtur* [*Quod vna tantũ sit actualis satisfactio, & ea sit nostra.*] Yea this is as it should be, thrust out *Christ*, & let vs only satisfie while

[b] *Bell. lib. 1. de Purgat. cap. 14. §. quarta Ratio.*

while he stands by and holds the Candle. Yet the *Iesuite* will not doe *Iesus* so much wrong: for marke, to mend the matter he addes. [*Neq; tamen excluditur Christus, vel satisfactio eius. Nam per eius satisfactionem habemus gratiam, vnde satisfacimus. Et hoc modo nobis dicitur applicari Christi satisfactio; non quòd immediatè ipsa eius satisfactio tollat pœnam temporalem nobis debitam: sed quod mediatè eam tollat, quatenùs gratiam ab eo habemus, sine quâ nihil valeret nostra satisfactio.*] Which words they may vnderstand that can; for I cannot. The *Iesuite* walkes in the darke: seeking to hide this shamefull iniurie to the Merits of Christ, but it will not bee. 'Tis too apparant that Christ is to them of no account. Onely for a fashion they make vse of his Name, when they haue reckoned vp a-bed role of their own Merits,& Saints merits, and such other trash, then to conclude all with a [*Per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum*] That's the burden of the song, and the oyle that seasons all the Salet: as [z] *Marnix* merrily.

z *Tabu'a de differentia 4. part. Tom. 2. f. 15.16.*

4 That distinction of *Satisfaction* in *Strict iustice*, and *satisfaction* in fauorable *acceptance* is vaine in this businesse. We grant indeed that our good workes done out of *Faith* are pleasing to God, and graciously accepted of him: but can it appeare, that God accepts them as *satisfactions* to his *Iustice?* No Scripture intimates any such thing, that God's fauour doth thus dispense with his iustice, and make that *satisfaction* acceptable, which is in it selfe no full satisfaction of his *Iustice*. Shall wee thinke that God in this case is put vpon those termes of *Necessity*, and *complement* which fall out in *humane satisfactions*, betweene man and man? It may so fall out that a Creditor (to whom 1000 Crownes are owing) may bee content if the debtor will yeeld vp his whole estate, though not worth 50. Because no more can be

had. So in case of offence, sometime a little formality, or a word or two of confession of the wrong may be accepted for satisfaction. But God wants no meanes to receiue full satisfaction of vs, either vpon our owne persons, or vpon *Christ for vs*. And therefore 'tis without ground to imagine such a facility and partiality of his *Iustice*, as to be satisfied with a few poore *complements all formalities*. Satisfactions to Gods *Iustice* we acknowledge none; but such as are in *Iustice* sufficient. Such are *Christs satisfactions*. But as for vs, we haue nothing to doe with satisfactions, but with free Pardons.

Bell. lib. 4. de Panit. cap. 1.

5 This doctrine of *humane satisfactions*, taught in the *Church of Rome* is altogether full of *vncertainty*, and *ergo*, brings no rest and *peace* vnto mens consciences at all. God pardons the fault: but requires the punishment say they. But when is this? Is it alwaies? No, sometimes he pardons both. But can they tell certainely when he doth? when not? At *Martyrdome* he pardons all. How knowe they that? or how knowe they he doth it not at other times too? *Contrition* (say they) if it be vehement, satisfies for all. But can they tell vs the iust measure of that *Contrition* which is satisfactory? It may be the party is contrite enough: yet the *Priest* enioynes Penance when 'tis needlesse. It may be he is not contrite enough: yet no *penance* enioyned. Where's the certainty, what's to bee done in such a case? *Christ* (say they) hath satisfied for the *Æternity of Hell punishment*. Well. But can they tell how many yeares or daies are left vnsatisfied for; that so all things may be fitted according to the race of time? Laborious workes, of *Praiers, Fastings, Almesdeeds*, satisfie for temporall punishments in this life, (say they) Suppose it be so. Are they sure they can also satisfie the paines of *Purgatory*? The *Priest* enioynes *satisfactory penance*. But is hee sure he enioynes iust so much as will doe the

the Feat? Is he certaine that God will take that for payment which he decrees to be paid? What if there be not *Aue-Maries* enough,&c? Againe,suppose there were *Euangelicall Counsailes*,as *Vowes of Chastity*,*Pouerty*,&c. and that to doe these things were pleasing vnto God. Are they sure they shall passe for *satisfactions* presently? Thou saist I giue this *Almes*, I vow *Pouerty*, I doe this and that to satisfie Gods Iustice for such or such a sinne. What? Is it a match presently,that God must doe as thou desirest: and take what thou offerest for payment? Soft there a while. Wheres the warrant for that? Those that are in *Purgatory*, when haue they satisfied enough? Who brings word, when they are deliuered? How knowes the *Pope* when he hath bestowed vpon them sufficient supererogatiue *Money* to pay the *Fees* of the *Prison*? Or doth St *Michael* that holds the *Scales* send him word,when their satisfactions weigh down their sins? Not to reckon more vp, there is in all this doctrine no firme ground whereon a distressed soule may cast anchor: But when it hath once let slip that maine Cable, wherevpon it might ride it out in al stormes (*the satisfaction of Christ*)afterwards it is carried a drift vpon all hazards of Windes & Seas.

6 Their practise betraies their Opinion. Did they indeed thinke that there were any seuerity in Gods iustice, any necessitie or sufficiencie in such their satisfaction, 'tis not possible, they would prostitute such things in so base a maner,as they doe. But when an *Aue Maria*, *a Pater noster* before such or such an *Altar*; *a wax Candle* to such a *Saint*; a *kisse* of such a *cold stone*; a *pilgrimage* to *Compostella* for *cockle shels*; a *lash or twaine* vpon the *Bare*; two or three *meals meat forborne*; a *pardon* purchased at a few *Deneirs*; yea when the roughnesse and meanesse of *Adams fig-leane breeches*

ches shall bee accounted a worthy matter to satisfie for his
De penit. l.4.c. 9.sect.5. Iren. sinne, as [a] *Bellarmine* most ridiculously dotes; I say, when such base trifles shall be reckoned to be *valuable satisfactions* to Gods *Iustice:* they must pardon vs if wee guesse at their meaning. They may dispute and talke while they will in big words and faire glosses of Bridles against sinnes, and I knowe not what: but in fine all proues but *Ginnes* to catch *money:* But such as serue themselues thus vpon God, & play with his Iustice, as the *flie* with the *Candle*; let them take heed, lest in the end, they be consumed by it.

To leaue then these vaine inventions. Let vs giue to God the *glory* that's due to his name: and so wee shall well prouide for the peace of our Soules. Trusting entirely and
[b] Act.4. v.12. only vnto that *Name of* [b] *Iesus Christ. Besides which, there is not in heauen, or in Earth* (in Man or Angell) *any name, Merit, Power, Satisfaction, or whatsoeuer else, whereby wee may be saued.* And thus much touching the first maine *branch* of the matter of our Iustification, namely, *Our owne Righteousnesse.* Whereby it appeares sufficiently, that wee shall neuer be iustified in *Gods Sight.*

Μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ δόξα. FINIS.